DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 058 494 AA 000 798

AUTHOR	Iannaccone, Laurence
TITLE	Problems of Financing Inner City Schools. Political, Social, and Cultural Constraints upon Financing Improved Urban Education and Proposals to Overcome Them.
INSTITUTION	Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Research Foundation.
SPONS AGENCY	President's Commission on School Finance, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	69p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Board Administrator Relationship; Boards of Education; Citizen Participation; Educational Administration; Educational Equality; *Educational Finance; Organization; *Policy Formation; Political Science; *Political Socialization; *Politics; Research Projects; *Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

Public policymaking issues, equality in education, political democracy, organizational efficiency, and citizen participation in urban schools are discussed. Because of the growing concern about policymaking arrangements for inner city schools, a longitudinal study was conducted from 1967-1970 in New York City, Boston, Los Angeles, Columbus, and Chicago by scholars representing political science and educational administration. A team in each city studied the local education board, the relationships between school boards and superintendents, the information bases and communication patterns of decisionmaking, and the policy-oriented relationships between school officials and influential parties. Significant features from each study are synthesized and the emerging issues within the project scope are examined. Analysts conclude that a cluster of social, cultural, and political dimensions of the urban school organization inhibit an equitable flow of resources to inner city schools and limit and lower the quality of urban education and educational policymaking. Thirteen federal policy suggestions are provided, and recommendations for overcoming financial constraints include avoiding noncategorical aid, reuniting State and urban educational governance, reforming the nation's educational information system, and improving the education profession's contribution. (For related document, see ED 058 473.) (Author/EA)

ED 058 494

Problems of Financing Inner-City Schools

Prepared by
The Ohio State University Research Foundation

AA 000 798

Submitted to The President's Commission on School Finance

THIS IS ONE OF SEVERAL REPORTS PREPARED FOR THIS COMMISSION. TO AID IN OUR DELIBERATIONS, WE HAVE SOUGHT THE BEST QUALIFIED PEOPLE AND INSTITUTIONS TO CONDUCT THE MANY STUDY PROJECTS RELATING TO OUR BROAD MANDATE. COMMISSION STAFF MEMBERS HAVE ALSO PREPARED CERTAIN REPORTS.

WE ARE PUBLISHING THEM ALL SO THAT OTHERS MAY HAVE ACCESS TO THE SAME COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS OF THESE SUBJECTS THAT THE COMMISSION SOUGHT TO OBTAIN. IN OUR OWN FINAL REPORT WE WILL NOT BE ABLE TO ADDRESS IN DETAIL EVERY ASPECT OF EACH AREA STUDIED. BUT THOSE WHO SEEK ADDITIONAL INSIGHTS INTO THE COMPLEX PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION IN GENERAL AND SCHOOL FINANCE IN PARTICULAR WILL FIND MUCH CONTAINED IN THESE PROJECT REPORTS.

WE HAVE FOUND MUCH OF VALUE IN THEM FOR OUR OWN DELIBERATIONS. THE FACT THAT WE ARE NOW PUBLISHING THEM, HOWEVER, SHOULD IN NO SENSE BE VIEWED AS ENDORSEMENT OF ANY OR ALL OF THEIR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS. THE COMMISSION HAS REVIEWED THIS REPORT AND THE OTHERS BUT HAS DRAWN ITS OWN CONCLUSIONS AND WILL OFFER ITS OWN RECOMMENDATIONS. THE FINAL REPORT OF THE COMMISSION MAY WELL BE AT VARIANCE WITH OR IN OPPOSITION TO VIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THIS AND OTHER PROJECT REPORTS.

The President's Commission
on School Finance

Neil H. McElroy, Chairman
Mary T. Brooks
William G. Colman
Hilda A. Davis
John B. Davis, Jr.
John H. Fischer
Dorothy M. Ford
Norman Francis
Eugene Gonzales
Warren P. Knowles
David H. Kurtzman
Duane Mattheis
William E. McManus
Wendell H. Pierce
William G. Saltonstall
W. B. Thompson
Clarence Walton
Ivan E. Zylstra

Norman Karsh, Executive Director

PROBLEMS OF FINANCING INNER CITY SCHOOLS

Political, Social, and Cultural Constraints Upon Financing Improved Urban Education and Proposals to Overcome Them

A Report to the President's National Commission on School Finance

by

Laurence Iannaccone

1971

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction to the Report	i
Abstract and Recommendations	1
Quality and Equality	8
The Primary Constraints	13
Sociological Constraints	15
Cultural Constraints	26
Political Constraints	31
Major Recommendations	43

Introduction to the Report

This report treats issues related to "political, social and cultural constraints which currently inhibit the optimum flow of available resources" to inner city schools. The recommendations in this report concentrate upon constraints produced by political factors rather than upon technical finance or economic aspects.

It is important to note the broad scope of the issues addressed in this report and the limitations that accompany such a research enterprise. Many of the important social and political questions of the past and present decades crop up in this report, especially the persistent issues of quality in education, equal educational opportunity, political democracy, organizational efficiency, citizen participation and public policymaking. The major limitation on this report is found in the terms of reference for the project. The data used for this research were collected during the years 1967-1970 in five cities by a consortium funded by the Danforth Foundation. Final reports on each city and a synthesis of the five are underway but are still incomplete. The chief limitation of this report is its dependence upon those studies. At the same time these studies provided a wealth of detailed data on the politics, decision making and administration of education in five cities such as could not have been assembled during the period of the present project even had there been virtually unlimited fiscal resources for it. A brief description of that work provides a perspective for the present project and this report.

Recognizing the growing public concern with regard to policymaking arrangements for urban schools, the Danforth Foundation has sponsored a longitudinal study of school policymaking in five cities. In the spring of 1967, the Foundation awarded grants to The Ohio State University, Claremont Graduate School, Harvard University, New York University, and the University of Chicago.[1] Under the general direction of Luvern L. Cunningham, Dean of the College of Education at Ohio State, a consortium of scholars representing the areas of educational administration and political science in the five institutions have studied school policy development in Boston, Chicago, Columbus, Los Angeles, and New York.

The work of the study team at each site focused upon the local board of education. Other areas of interest included the working relationships between school boards and superintendents, communication patterns and information bases related to decision making, and the policy oriented relationships which school officials maintained with other interested and influential parties.

---

[1] Senior staff members participating in this study included Dean Cunningham, Raphael O. Nystrand, and James H. Andrews at Ohio State; Conrad Briner and George Blair at Claremont; Joseph Cronin and Leonard Fein at Harvard; Frank Lutz, Richard Lonsdale, and Harland Bloland at New York University; Paul Peterson and Thomas Williams at the University of Chicago; and Laurence Iannaccone who aided the teams at Ohio State, Harvard, and New York University.

Within these general parameters, each university study team chose a perspective and focused upon issues of local interest. The New York City team, for example, studied the reorganization struggle in that city and compared the behavior of two local or decentralized boards with that of the central board. The Boston group focused upon the function of the Boston schools as an employment system as well as an educational system. The Chicago team analyzed school policy development in terms of political bargaining, professional-bureaucratic constraints, and rational decision-making models. Considerable attention was given in that study to the linkages between school and municipal politics. In Los Angeles, particular attention was given to board-staff relationships in policy development. The Columbus group compared the processes through which local school officials and city government officials developed policy for their respective institutions.

Despite the fact that these studies officially terminated in 1970, the researchers involved have continued to note recent developments in what have become their "laboratories." Discussions conducted with them during the course of the present project for the President's Commission on School Finance have helped update their findings for this report. Finally, the involvement of Dr. Joseph Cronin and Professor L. Iannaccone during the winter and spring of 1971 in a study for the New York State Commission on Quality, Cost and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education was useful too.

It cannot be allowed to go without saying that we are grateful to the members of the consortium teams in each of the five cities for access to their extensive files of interviews, observational reports, numerous position papers, early and recent drafts of chapters for their books and dissertations produced in connection with their studies. In addition, Professors Briner, Cronin, Lonsdale, Nystrand and Peterson shared their insights into each of their cities. Concerned as the present project is with recommendations for federal policy with an emphasis on common factors constraining quality education, much of what is uniquely significant in each of their studies has been omitted. It follows that they are therefore not responsible for the synthesis made here or the recommendations presented.

The final synthesis and recommendations had the benefit of consultation with Dean Cunningham and Professor Nystrand of Ohio State, periodically through the early part of the work but especially during the last three weeks of report writing in Columbus. However, the present researcher bears responsibility for the report and for whatever weaknesses may be present in it. They exist despite the assistance of his colleagues in the five cities as well as the consultants.

The report examines issues which emerge from the term of reference for this project and the data in the studies of the five cities. Because most of the issues discussed were seen as a result of examining materials as yet unpublished, the synthesis is more extensive than would have been the case had simple citation of published material been possible.

As the Commission reviews these data and judgments it will become clear that some of the recommendations deserve additional staff study and translation into programs and a format useful to legislators. In a sense, then, this document is mainly a review of research and problems so identified. It is only one step in the development of policies and plans.

I

Abstract and Recommendations

I

Abstract and Recommendations

The study of the materials on the five cities leads to the conclusion that a cluster of social, cultural and political dimensions of the urban school organization inhibit an equitable flow of resources to inner city schools. In addition, they limit and lower the quality of urban education and educational policymaking.

The conflicting demands of policymaking and education create a dilemma for urban school organizations. The organizational structures currently found between the classroom and the board are a problem.

Conflict between educational practitioners and clients, (pupils and parents) about the school's tasks produce another sort of constraint on quality and equity in urban schools. The belief in professional isolation from the public makes more difficult the resolution of that conflict. An extensive myth concerning educational governance is part of the educationist culture. The ideology of school governance further exacerbates the problems.

Educational politics have isolated city systems from the state. The development of a special political subculture in urban education has upset the balance of public and employee influence on policymaking, managing and teaching. The public and especially the new urban poor are disadvantaged by current governance and political patterns in urban education.

Discussion of these conclusions occupies section II and III of this report. The discussion of constraints led to fifteen related recommendations. Finally in section IV, "Major Recommendations for Federal Policy," five additional major recommendations are discussed in some detail.

Summary of Recommendations in the Sections II and III

Concerning Definitions

1. A necessary condition for quality education is the engagement of the pupil's interests in the learning process.

2. The support of adults, neighbors and families, in direct contact with pupils is a second condition needed for quality.

Federal Policy Should:

1. At least assure equality of educational in-puts as traditionally defined. It should move toward the inclusion of within school elements interacting upon pupil learning: e.g. teacher expectations, attitudes towards the children, and school social climate. It should begin to pave the way for including results of schools as additional elements in defining equal opportunity for education.

2. Provide more dollars to the schools needing it most and also to assure that states and cities will be doing likewise.

3. Develop a responsible autonomy in the classroom, the school building and at higher levels of the school.

4. Assure employee compliance with board policies without sacrificing the autonomy necessary for quality education.

5. Shorten the organizational distance between public policymaking and educational task achievement in the urban school district.

6. Confront the reality of conflicting beliefs about the educational task between most practitioners and most clients in the inner school and search for solutions consistent with that contemporary reality.

7. Reduce sharply the isolation of the urban educators from the public. It should reknit the family to the classroom, the school building to its attendance area and the school district generally to its city.

8. Help urban schools move towards more realistic beliefs about educational governance through an increase in board independence from its organized employees and a greater reliance upon the public, all of it, including the poor and inexpert.

9. Reduce the wall of separation between the states and their large school districts.

10. Improve the balance of public and employee influence on policymaking in urban school government.

11. Open the selection processes for board membership to inner city residents.

12. Upgrade the contributions of the educational professions in educational governance.

13. Provide the new urban poor with legitimate access to full participation in educational governance.

10

Summary of Recommendations
from Section IV

Major recommendations offered in greater detail are found below.

A. Avoid Non-Categorical Aid

1. Federal policy should assure that all federal funds to urban education is categorical. The clearest guidelines possible should be used. These need not preclude broken front approaches or flexibility at grassroots but should specify federal purpose and establish means for making local judgments on federal programs.

2. A gradation of penalties should exist with federal guidelines to avoid the use of ultimate sanctions too early. Urban districts need to learn that federal guidelines are intended to be followed.

3. Congress and the President should be explicit about federal intent and direction in legislation rather than leaving the burden of direction on guidelines and administrative offices.

B. Multi-Tier Educational Governments

1. Federal policy should influence the development of multi-tier governance structures in urban education. These should be allocated different functions as appropriate to the populations subject to the respective tiers. In general, the broadest public interests in education should be allocated to the highest levels of governmental tiers. The level closest to the classroom should be most concerned with the individual pupil.

2. Multiple tier governance in the larger cities should include at least three levels of representative government: Central board, regional boards and local building or K-12 pyramid boards. Representatives for each level should be elected from sub-districts rather than at large so as to provide representation for each city's large minority populations as well as for the dominant majority.

3. Allocations of functions to each level should be made explicit, preferably by law. This is to prevent the gradual absorption by one tier of the functions appropriately allocated to other tiers.

4. Each tier of government should be allocated resources appropriate to its functions. No tier should be without resources to conduct some of its own research and development as well as innovation attempts.

5. Federal programs should immediately require the involvement of elected groups of representatives along the lines proposed above. In

this way, present federal programs can provide a beginning step toward multi-tier urban educational governance. Independently based dialogue around urban educational problems can begin immediately.

C. Reunite State and Urban Educational Governance

1. Federal policy should have the objective of reknitting state and urban educational government. This objective should be approached directly and indirectly. It can be approached indirectly by making it a rule that all federal programs aiding urban education be channeled through the states. Such programs should place explicit responsibility upon the state for accountability to the federal government for urban operation of federal programs. At the same time such programs should stipulate mechanisms to be available upon the initiative of urban pupils and parents for state action to assure local educational authority compliance with federal policies.

2. State departments should increase their involvement in large cities by opening offices within them making access to the state department easier for urban dwellers.

3. State governments should provide more educational services and resources to urban education. State education department personnel should reflect better the balance of urban-rural school populations. State department recruitment programs should seek to overcome the present paucity of urban experience in their personnel. Federal programs to facilitate the training of students with urban backgrounds for roles in in state education departments would offer a direct approach to the problem.

4. The inbred urban personnel system should be opened to regular state licensure. Criteria for all personnel paid by federal funds should require state certification. They should explicitly disallow recipient cities from adding local licensing requirements for such personnel. Such provisions would facilitate the employment of qualified minority group professionals.

5. The growth of metropolitanism should be supported either by governmental mergers of urban and suburban school districts or by the creation of metropolitan cooperative structures. Administrative units or local accounting regions for federal programs e.g. Title III, should be constructed so as to combine the large city and suburbs. Alternately urban sub-districts with community boards should be allowed to enter into cooperative arrangements with local districts outside the city. Conversely federal programs should reject state or local proposals which reinforce the boundary between the large city and the rest of the state.

6. The federal government should establish programs for training students with urban backgrounds (especially from minority groups) for

state department roles. Urban focused internship and fellowship programs tied to state department training should be created. Similar programs should exist for legislative interns. These will link graduate training and state government around urban problems.

D. Responsible Autonomy

1. Federal policy should foster the development of local representation at or near the building level.

2. Building councils should represent the constituencies necessary for solving local problems. This means at least pupils, teacher, parents and community should be represented.

3. Appointment of representatives from one constituency by leaders of another will not work. It is clear that especially with minority groups appointment of minority group persons by leaders of the majority usually result in selecting marginal men, sometimes in tokenism. In addition, a major purpose of responsible autonomy, the acceptance of responsibility for the outcomes of decisions, is defeated by such selection. Election or appointment to building councils of persons by others who have themselves been elected by the same constituency is the guideline to be followed.

4. Residence in an attendance area should constitute one base of election for representatives of the public. Parents of pupils residing outside the attendance areas of buildings they attend should have the same rights as parents residing in the attendance area. This can be assured by separate representation of parents chosen only by parents. It can be done by letting people vote in both their area of residence (as members of a neighborhood) and where their children attend schools (as parents).

5. Plans for building councils must be carefully made before bringing them into existence. Their roles must be especially clear. The limits on such roles must be clear at the outset to avoid unfruitful conflicts.

6. Building level councils must be given terms of reference distinguishing their functions from regional offices or boards and from the central board.

7. Continuing education of professionals is needed for responsible autonomy. Distinctions should be made between the on the job training given new teachers, e.g. less than five years and older ones. Joint training with parents, community representatives and pupils should be undertaken. Generally training should not be attached to credits or degrees. It should focus on problem solving. The problems should be real and emerge from local situations. The central board should

allocate resources to local councils for them to conduct studies of their situation and bring in consultants to help them.

8. System-wide formulae to allocate resources equitably across a large range of regions should provide discretion to building principals, staffs and local communities. Building schedules, the ratio of teachers to pupils for given activities and team teaching should be managed at building levels within equitable resource allocations.

9. A portion of central board funds for innovation should be earmarked for projects proposed by buildings. Here inequality of distribution should be the guide. No building, however, should be completely without resources for innovation.

E. Reforming the Nation's Educational Information System

1. Federal policy should influence the development of a national educational information system.

2. Measurement and evaluation of educational programs constitutes one major form of information needed for urban, state or federal planning. States should be encouraged to develop measurement and evaluation systems including e.g. costs of operations, academic achievement and measurement of affective developments.

3. Information must be available annually on a building by building basis. Otherwise comparisons of inner city schools with others will not be possible. Even if the day comes when equal investments are made to inner city schools their adult communities will not believe it without such data. School building profiles should be developed annually. Federal program requirements can lead the way.

4. Information should be public. Democracy does not work without public information. If information concerning educational activities, costs and results is concealed from the public or reported so that it cannot be used by them, they will make bad decisions in the short run and lose faith in the long run. Public data provide a base for community involvement and action to protect the public interest. Otherwise there will be no compliance with federal policy or compliance will require an army of federal inspectors.

5. Information for educational decision making should be drawn more broadly than from education alone. A total information system should permit "cross sector" analyses. For example educational policy planners should understand the implications for education of public investment in welfare. And the reverse implications should be noted too.

F. Improving the Education Profession's Contribution

1. The federal government should undertake with the state and city cooperatively to support programs of inservice training for urban educators.

2. Such programs should not be designed to earn college or salary credits. There is too great a chance already that the extrinsic rewards attached to such things as advanced course work outweighs the intrinsic ones in motivating people into in-service activities. In-service training detached from extra pay and college credits is recommended.

3. In-service training programs should include as participants all persons needed for effective education in the inner city: teachers, administrators, counselors, pupils, parents, community leaders and school supporting personnel.

4. Re-training should be problem oriented. The problems taken up should insofar as possible be current and local. Problems, in the final analysis, can be solved only where they are.

5. In-service joint training should attempt to reknit the school, family and neighborhood. It should, also, seek to use underutilized human resources in the process. For example, combinations of teachers, para-professionals, high school students and parents could function as learning teams working on problems in middle schools.

6. Joint training experiences combining the work of municipal officials with school people should be undertaken. The exchange of jobs for brief learning periods is likely to reduce conflict among public agencies having a common interest in children.

7. The federal support for in-service training should be provided to facilitate the reformation of educational governance as well as the operations in districts undergoing restructuring. There is little point in attempting in-service training for major changes in urban schools that are unready to accept the risks of change.

II

Quality and Equality

This section deals with the dual concepts of quality and equality in education within the frame of reference of the inner city schools.

Pragmatically this discussion is guided by the conservative assumption that the President's Advisory Commission's recommendations may modify, but will not fundamentally alter, the present relations among the family of federal, state and local governments in education.

The rule of necessary if not sufficient conditions provides another guideline for this report to highlight aspects of quality education and equality in inner city schools now lacking or clearly endangered by the present situation.

Quality Education

The concept of quality education is an evolving one. Federal policy cannot wait for ultimate definition. This much can be said. Operational definitions of quality education for the seventies must assume a high level of willing, even joyous, involvement of the learners in the process of learning. If not sufficient for learning, such involvement is at least a necessary condition which is either missing or in jeopardy in schools today. This is true generally and particularly in inner city schools.[1]

Especially essential in these schools is the mastery of skills and understanding which immediately make sense to the pupil, or learning processes which engage the interest of the learner. Teachers and school systems talk of long deferred rewards to people who have heard such rhetoric for a long time without experiencing pay off. There can be no quality education for these pupils unless their interests are engaged in the process not just in its results. That education is good for twelve or more years afterwards is not very meaningful to a first grader. It is even less meaningful if he is interacting at home and in a neighborhood without educated role models, the circumstance of most inner city pupils. For this practical reason, if for no other, a necessary condition for quality education is the engagement of the pupil's interests in the learning process. The school is only part of the process and cannot play its part well without family or community support. Therefore, the support of adults, neighbors and families, in direct contact with pupils is a second condition needed for quality.

These may appear as minimal conditions for quality education, perhaps so minimal as to be assumed as givens in the educational venture. They are not givens. In fact, the data collected during our three years of research suggest they are often absent. They offer evidence of increasing disaffection from schools of adults and pupils in the inner city. If these conditions are not sufficient to ensure quality, they are necessary and they appear even more lacking toward the latter period of our studies.

---

[1] Silberman, Charles E., Crisis in the Classroom, New York: Random House, 1970.

Equality[1]

When attention is turned to inner city schools in contrast to others, equality becomes a central issue. The concept of equality of educational opportunity has varied in the past and has changed radically in recent years. Historically in the United States, the concept included four input elements of providing a free education with a common curriculum to children attending the same school within a given local school government. The assumptions underlying these criteria of equality of educational opportunity do not stand the test of contemporary realities.

The Supreme Court decisions of 1954, subsequent legislation and recent court decisions indicate changes are still underway in the definition of equal opportunity.

The inclusion of criteria regarding the racial and social composition of the school's student population in the definition of equality broadened and changed the definition by including the nature of the learners assembled by local governmental policies. Other elements were added to the dialogue of equal educational opportunity.[2] They include "such things as teacher morale, teachers' expectations of students, level of interest of the student body in learning, or others."[3] Finally, equality of educational opportunity can be viewed in terms of results. This reasoning led the U.S.O.E. to the following conclusion concerning the definition of equality and the Office's role. "Such a definition will be an outcome of the interplay of a variety of interests, and will certainly differ from time to time as these interests differ. It should be our role to cast light on the state of inequality defined in the variety of ways which appear reasonable at this time."[4]

The trend of redefinition is aimed at broadening the elements considered, adding factors about the social climate of teaching and looking toward criteria of results. In so redefining equality our society is enlarging the federal role in education. Federal policy choice must begin with the realization that only the federal government has the responsibility for assuring equal opportunity for all Americans. No city nor state government can be expected to think about populations outside of its writ. However, research indicates that at present inequality of educational opportunity is the rule even when traditional 19th century definitions are used. Contrary to the assumptions implicit in traditional definitions, research indicates that "the lower the measure of socio-economic status, the lower the measure of school service quality."[1] (3457) This conclusion follows from comparisons of the quality of teachers (verbal abilities), facilities (building age), institutional services (remedial opportunities), and educational innovations. Thus the schooling of low socio-economic pupils, is characterized by less able teachers, working in the poorest facilities offering the fewest remedial opportunities. These pupils are last to receive the fruit of educational research and development.

---

[1] Special issue entitled, "Equal Educational Opportunity," of the Harvard Educational Review Vol. 38, No. 1, Winter 1968.

[2] Office of Education Survey of Equality of Educational Opportunity executed under the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

[3] Coleman, James, "The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity," Harvard Educational Review Vol. 38, No. 1, Winter 1968, p. 18.

[4] Ibid., p. 19.

These inequalities are not the result of disparities in wealth of local districts only. Despite the influence of Title 1 of E.S.E.A., the overall effect of federal funding permits wealthy districts to receive as much or more federal aid as poor ones. Federal aid in the sixties did little to decrease the inequality in education, although it may have arrested the development of greater inequality.

Present federal policy should at least assure equality of educational in-puts as traditionally defined. It should move toward the inclusion of within school elements interacting upon pupil learning; e.g. teacher expectations, attitudes towards the children, and school social climate. It should begin to pave the way for including results of schools as additional elements in defining equal opportunity for education.

As a start it should be taken into account that, pupils of the inner city begin their schooling with more physical disabilities and less psychological preparation for adjusting to the procedures of formal education. If we expect the results of schooling to provide equal opportunities in later life, then greater schooling resources should be given to those who begin disadvantaged.

The effort needed is not likely of accomplishment without local and state governments. The fact is that schools must expend more on lower socioeconomic status groups.

---

[1] James W. Guthrie, George B. Kleindorfer, Henry M. Levin, and Robert T. Stout, "Educational Equality, School Finance, and a Plan for the '70's," a paper prepared for presentation at the N.E.A. Annual Conference on School Finance, April 6, 1970, San Francisco, California.

At issue is the question of Federal goals. If tax relief for local and state governments is the first federal goal, then unrestricted federal disbursements to states and cities will help a little for a short time. If changing inner city education has priority federal funds should be targeted and distributed in such ways as to produce similar targeting for state and local funds.

Federal policy should be designed to provide more dollars to the schools needing them most and to assure that state and city policies will do likewise.

III

The Primary Constraints

III

The Primary Constraints

The major conclusion of the search of the materials on the five cities is that a central set of interrelated constraints exists which currently inhibit an equitable flow of available resources to the schools of the inner city needing them most. The primary constraints directly influencing educational decision-making and policy formulation consist of a cluster of political, social and cultural aspects of school organization and school employee groups.

The primary sociological constraints on improving inner city schools are found in the urban school district's organizational structures. The distance between the point in the urban school organization at which representatives of the public make policy and the point at which learning takes place is great. We refer to it as the pupil learning-public policy-making chasm. Cultural constraints are found in educational ideologies about key elements related to that chasm, specifically what is believed about the school's purposes, the isolation of teaching, and doctrines about educational governance. The political constraints largely reflect the phenomena of a self interested public employee system adjusting to local political environments while attempting to implement the urban educationist ideology.

A Basic Dilemma

A basic dilemma exists between the requirements for pupil learning and the requirements for discharging public responsibility. The one demands personalistic, idiosyncratic and flexible behavior; the other requires impersonal, universalistic and consistent behavior.

Teaching-learning is accomplished with individuals. What happens to a specific pupil--not an abstract entity or a class--determines what has been taught and learned. Flexibility in teacher strategies and tactics is implied in the task of teaching. Most of these must be activated spontaneously by a particular teacher for a specific pupil. Therefore universalistic constraints upon the flexibility of teacher strategies and tactics will fail to produce quality education. Removing such constraints, however, does not provide assurance of quality.

The interaction of pupil and teacher should be characterized by flexibility in teacher strategy and tactics. This implies particularistic values and behavior.

In contrast, the public interest in education is expressed through the American family of governments: federal, state, county, municipal, school and others. Most of their actions result in impersonal, universal and consistent rules. Even the authoritative implementation of the rights and privileges of citizens results in general rules. Thus the local school board as a policy making arena is constrained. Within these constraints the board exercises discretion to carry forward the public interest in schools on a day to day basis.

Board policymaking itself must be concerned with general policies and rules. Some of its work involves contractual relations with groups of people. Much of its work involves overseeing of the school district as a whole. The board is concerned with reports often summarizing many activities in the schools. It seldom has time to attend to individual buildings. Classrooms or a specific pupil-teacher pair get less attention. Even when hearing complaints or requests from individual parents, it seeks to make its decisions with reference to general policy. Indeed, the research in the five cities suggests boards could not modify general patterns, processes and rules enough to accommodate to the needs of large minorities, let alone individual cases.

Policymaking is accomplished by considering a wide range of public interests, local variations and general societal needs. Universal rules, equality of rights, and consistency of behavior are implied in the task of policymaking.

The characteristics of policymaking conflict with those of teaching-learning. Boards should seek to discharge their responsibility fairly, equitably and for all the district and still leave room for the fullest scope of flexibility in the classroom. Board policies must discharge the public interest by delegating discretion of details to professionals in the schools. This requirement implies practitioner autonomy and raises the question of how that autonomy can be made responsible.

In the five cities studied, a singularly significant organizational relationship between policymaking and pupil learning emerges. Because of the multiple organizational layers of hierarchical offices and discrete compartments in the urban school system the distance between the pupil-teacher relationship and the arena of public policymaking is unbelievably great. The contrasting nature of teaching and policymaking makes that distance and its implications more significant than it might be for some other enterprise.

Sociological Constraints

Several sociological dimensions related to the pupil learning-public policymaking chasm constrain decisionmaking for quality in inner city schools. These are:

1. The classroom teachers world of work and its function in the socialization process of producing school leaders.

2. The boards' policymaking environment and its dependency upon both professional administrative staffs for leadership and teacher cooperation for implementation.

3. The social distance between the locus of task accomplishment in the urban school and the locus of public responsibility for that school.

The classroom: the teachers world of work

The significance of the classroom as a teacher's world of work may be appraised by observing the molding effects of work activities. If the inanimate objects of the assembly line in a man's work world has an effect upon his outlook, imagine the greater effects of human groups in another person's work world. Moreover, the classroom is the first rung on the ladder of educational leadership, administration of urban schools, or of urban school teacher organizations. The classroom functions as a molder of teacher ideology. It is a key socialization stage in development of the profession's leadership.

The classroom's need for flexibility requires autonomy characteristic of true professions in the practitioner-client relationship. Professionals deal with clients whose welfare is of critical importance to the society. The autonomy of the individual practitioner exists in the true profession and is not generally abused because of stringent collegial controls. Without this, practitioner autonomy becomes a hazard, at least to the society. Indeed, when teachers speak of autonomy, they mean freedom from all restraint, even collegial controls.

The classroom involves custodial functions by its nature, i.e. the combination of a number of pupils with one teacher having power over them. Teacher concern for pupil control is central to schools. Inner city schools even more than others display the use of external control devices such as coercion, ridicule and the witholding of rewards. The over-emphasis upon external control and concern for docility of pupils at the expense of learning is a probable outcome of the classroom situation if autonomy exists without responsibility.

Research on teacher attitude formation and development generally indicates that the induction experience into the classroom teacher role has the impact of reinforcing the custodial view of teaching. Even in suburban schools the sense of an inherent built-in conflict between teacher and pupils looms large. Pupil control needs and the teacher as disciplinarian is central to the student teaching experience.[1]

---

[1] Iannaccone, Laurence and Button, H. Warren, Functions of Student Teaching, St. Louis: Washington University, Graduate Institute of Education, 1964.

Moreover, research on the early years of teaching indicates a continued increase in custodial ideology.[1] Peer group pressures at building levels support and deepen the custodial ideology.[2]

Parents are not viewed by this ideology as legitimate influentials upon teacher behavior, however well they may know their children. Building administration is also not viewed as legitimately influential in teacher classroom behavior except as the principal's influence rests upon a personal relationship--one of solving the teacher's problems.

The classroom world of work exists within a social context without effective supervisory roles evaluating and monitoring what happens in the classroom. For example, as long ago as the early forties New York City Schools had effectively stopped evaluating probationary teachers.[3]

The public school system has essentially a captive clientele delivered annually through compulsory attendance requirements. The custodial attitude is partially the product of the monopoly over children held by the school.[4]

The situation in which the client does not choose the practitioner, nor he the client, is most likely to produce the equivalent of the mental hospital back wards, where no one expects cures to take place.

It is highly probable that conflict between teachers and pupils will develop in such a work setting. That high probability becomes inevitable when, as in the inner city, large cultural differences exist between teacher and pupil. The confrontation between teacher and pupil extends to including parents and building principals. Principals tend to share the custodial outlook. Principals are increasingly caught in typical middle-management problems worsened by contract relations which have, in the last decade, severely reduced their discretion.

---

[1] Rabinowitz, William and Rosenbaum, Ira, "Teaching Experience and Teachers' Attitudes," Elementary School Journal, 60: 313-319, March 1960.

[2] Willower, Donald J., Eidell, Terry L., and Hoy, Wayne K., The School and Pupil Control Ideology, The Pennsylvania State University Studies, Number 24, Pennsylvania State University: University Park, 1967.

ED 016279 Research in Education, July 1968, Vol. 13, No. 7.

[3] Strayer, George, "Interim Report of the New York City Subcommittee of the Joint Legislative Committee on the State Education System, Transmitted to the Legislature March 8, 1943," Albany: Williams Press, Inc. 1943.

[4] Carlson, Richard O., "Environmental Constraints and Organizational Consequences: The Public School and Its Clients," Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, edited by Daniel E. Griffiths. The Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society of Education, Part II, Chicago: The Society, 1964.

The classroom teacher demands that the educational professionals in the hierarchy above the classroom act as buffers to protect the classroom teacher's autonomy. Our data indicate a pervasive belief that the professionals higher up in the organization should deal with the pressure of minorities and politics. Each level expresses the belief that it should not have to take account of political realities or minority groups in its work--as if teaching could be accomplished apart from the public and without taking a pupil's familial and ethnic worlds into consideration. As well, each organizational level expresses the belief and articulates the demand for autonomy from the organizational level above and from the public.

An irresponsible autonomy is the result of such demands.[1] Nevertheless, teachers and administrators seeking autonomy do not view that status as irresponsible. Instead, they view it as an effort to increase the "professional" nature of their behavior and decisions. This honest belief in the "rightness" of professional autonomy facilitates the violation of even school district policy.

Protection against such developments in present school organizations turns on three sorts of mechanisms: (1) a teacher's own capacity to resist the self-erosion of a pupil-client centered orientation, (2) the school system's supervisory structure, and (3) the pupil's capacity to appeal outside that structure. The fact that between 1967-1970 pupils in the five cities increasingly turned toward that third mechanism suggests the decreasing strength of the other two.

Other evidence supports this conclusion. The study period saw that increased constraints upon the power of the supervisory structure resulted from negotiations. Teacher militancy did not only affect salaries, but also increased classroom teacher autonomy from the building principal and the rest of the supervisory structure. School boards likewise found themselves caught up endlessly in demands from parents and minority groups.

There was a significant increase in the engagement of third parties, neither members of the educational establishment nor pupils, but public officials at national, municipal, and state levels.

---

[1] The extent to which the system has taken the allocation of responsibility for the client from the teacher is discussed in Briner, Conrad and Iannaccone, Laurence, "Selected Social Power Relationships in Education" Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 2, No. 3, Autumn 1966, pp. 190-203.

In sum, the classroom itself has a powerful tendency to produce a custodial orientation and a demand for autonomy. Teacher peer groups reinforce this orientation. Sole reliance upon the teacher to resist this development in "his" classroom and in himself cannot hope to work. The final weakening of already weak middle management positions of principal and supervisor have left an irresponsible autonomy in the classroom. Increased conflict between practitioner and client goes on within the classroom from which neither is allowed to escape except at serious cost. Naturally the weaker party in that arena turns to coalitions of organized alliances in an effort to force the conflict to a place where legal decision making power resides. The stronger party seeks to prevent that movement and to control the policy makers. The choice is between responsible or irresponsible autonomy.

Federal policy should seek to develop a responsible autonomy in the classroom, the school building and at higher levels of the school.

The Policy-making World of Work

The responsibility for representing the public interest in day to day school operations is placed by our system of governance in the school board. Boards act with severe limits upon their discretion. The entire body of constitutional law and court decisions concerning Americans has implications for day to day school operations. Education law constrains board actions. The board's fundamental role is one of allocation of values within these limits and the adjustments necessary to the local situation.

Boards function in a combination of quasi legislative, quasi executive and quasi judicial roles. The board characteristically discharges its public responsibility for the executive function by: (1) contracting with a chief school officer, (2) receiving his reports and asking questions about them, and (3) approving expenditures.

Its legislative functions emerge in policies. These are usually the result of proposals by its staff directly or via board committees, standing or ad hoc in nature. The data on the five cities indicate almost complete reliance upon the chief school officer and staff for information, ideas, and leadership in the formulation of policies.

The boards' judical role comes into play as appeals from the school district operations and administrative decisions are carried to it as the ultimate court within the local district's government. In three of the five cities--Los Angeles, New York and Columbus--board response to matters carried to it by advocates representing client complaints resulted in conflict and frustration between boards and their administrative employees. A similar condition had existed in Chicago before Redmond came to the general superintendency. In Boston, the board, with neither minority group representation nor significantly affected by the municipal reform ideology, differed least with its administrative staff. It experienced an increase in appeals and complaints as well as criticism from the media.

Finally the boards studied were making policy in yet another way. The boards negotiated and contracted with employee units concerning salaries and conditions of employment. Two factors appear significant in this connection. The boards were ill-suited to this function because increasingly in New York and Chicago where the negotiating process is in fullest bloom, the intervention of the mayor's office was needed. Second, the contractual determination of where most of the monies of the district will be spent (in fact at times in New York and Chicago more than their board's had!) almost completely eliminated board discretion over school operations.

Contracts, policy statements, fiscal allocations, system-wide reports, implementing state law, and carrying out federal court decisions demand a condition in the policy-making arena opposite to that required for learning. Policies demand consistency to be useful; without certitude there is no justice. To be equitable law must be impersonal falling equally on all in the category over which it is competent. In these essential elements of policy-making, lies one side of a major paradox in governing urban education today. The requirements of the policy-making task are fundamentally in conflict with the requirements for autonomy in the teacher's work world.

Historically the urban schools have coped with this dilemma by developing a gray area, a penumbra of buffer zones, including the board and the administrative structure between the classroom and the state. A series of accommodations including the power of administrators over teachers, the adjustment of board and chief officer relationships, consensus inside the employee system and the cooperation of neighborhood and school have been necessary to cope with the problem.

As these old accommodations broke down the weakness of boards as the center of educational governance became clear. The weakness may be illustrated in two areas needed for policy, information and ideas.

Board policymaking is dependent upon information above all else. The board does not have meaningful information sources independent of the administrative line and staff organization. The studies examined for the Commission indicated a lack of independent board staffs. They also had weak informal communication links with the public in many cases. Norms exist against individual board members initiating independent contact with school people and against school people contacting board members. Some board members shut off complaints from the public rather than express receptivity to them. Continuous board member referral of complaints to the administrative organization further reduces the flow of information to the board.

The studies of the line and staff handling of information below the board level underscored further the boards' weakness. Information control is directed in every city studied to suppress information concerning trouble at each level from the level above. In addition, bureaucratic departments hide information which could be used by a competing department and overload the information system with irrelevant data.[1] Information control worked both ways. Similar overload and concealment was found down the line, so no one near the bottom of the structure knew what was really happening above.

Board policymaking is dependent upon ideas, concepts, models, and plans to deal with educational problems. The dependence upon professional expertise may be greater in education than in many other public service areas. In Columbus where the study team emphasized the comparison of educational with municipal government, this tendency was clearly apparent. In the other cities as well only after prodding by boards did educationist staffs begin to plan in any other than stereotyped ways for dealing with the problems of inner city schools. In Chicago the non-education architects of the city's planning unit displayed more adherence to the needs of flexibility in buildings than did the school people. Seldom did new ideas come in expect when boards went outside their districts for studies.

Boards are dependent upon employees to carry out policies. One board member interviewed made the following observation. Board members do not make laws or ordinances. They make policies which, unlike municipal ordinances, do not carry direct sanctions. Moreover policies are supposed to be policed by the people to whom they apply.

The dilemma between the requirements of the policymaking world and the teachers' work world are akin to the differences between law and people. Policies must be flexibly applied to the teacher-pupil world. The application must carry the spirit of the policy, not just its letter. The writing of policy presumes dependence upon professionals carrying forward of the policy in spirit. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that professionals failed to play appropriate roles in dealing with minority groups and poor pupils.

The data from the studies indicate board efforts to deal with such problems. They further indicate a failure of educationist leadership to provide fresh ideas, new concepts, creative models, and innovative plans.[2] Some of the boards studied attempted to open new avenues to by-pass the barriers of resistance. In Los Angeles, New York, and Columbus many school employees sought to defeat incumbent board members or new candidates working to open the information system.

---

[1] Cronin, Joseph M., and Hailer, Richard M., Organizing an Urban School System for Diversity, Boston: McBer and Company, 1970, pp 21-22.

[2] These findings are not surprising in view of those of Robert Crain. Crain, Robert L., The Politics of School Desegregation, Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1968.

In a sum a fundamental difference exists between the world of work for teaching learning and that of policymaking. The one requires autonomy and maximum flexibility. The other needs the certitude of law and impersonality. The adjustment historically made to the dilemma produced by these conflicting needs has depended upon professional leadership and cooperation. Confronted with employee opposition to policy, the board is helpless in the present structure of governing education.

Federal policy should seek means to assure employee compliance with board policies without sacrificing the autonomy necessary for quality education.

Chasm Between Classroom and Board

Many factors contributed to the development of the present urban school organization with its multiple offices, levels and compartments between the classroom and the board. Most important may be the fundamental dilemma discussed earlier. A second factor is the adoption of the factory model for schools and the complex production enterprise analogy for urban school organizations early in this century. A third is the view of urban schools as large bureaucracies with the belief that they are controlled in minutest detail by central offices. The American belief in the affectively neutral expert administrator undergirds the bureaucratic model.[1] Faith in the professional's neutral expertise, commitment to the client, and compliance with lay control is essential to maintaining the present urban educational organization characterized by the long distance between the classroom and the board.

One revealing trend during the late 1960's in data was the growing loss of credibility of school people with board members, economic notables and intellectuals. The sequence of disenchantment was approximately the same in several cities although its timing varied.[2] The disenchantment sequence moved through three areas of public interest in education. The profession was found wanting in each, failing to supply adequate relevant information, lacking plans and falling short in follow through. First were problems of minority pupils' education--most often black and Spanish speaking but more recently others. Second were issues related to funding especially as these demanded hard choices of priorities. Finally, the issues of pupil achievement, especially as questions began to be asked about performance in white as well as black schools, challenged the credibility of the expertise of school people.

---

[1] Kaufman, Herbert and Jones, Victor, "Mystery of Power" Public Administration Review, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 205-212, 1954.

[2] In New York the process had been underway somewhat earlier. In Chicago the process began late. Boston and Los Angeles fell between. In Columbus it seemed to start last but move rapidly.

Board members and economic notables in most of our cities expressed their disenchantment with professional leadership in the area of minority group education. By the end of the 1960's their schools had failed to find solutions. Leadership toward solutions was often lacking.[1] Chief school officers, key central office administrators, district superintendents and others were continuously prodded by board members and citizens. The boards were coming under increasing pressure from diverse publics--federal and state officials, city politicians and the public media.

The failure was interpreted as educator arrogance by some. One economic notable, after a discussion of inner city school problems with his school superintendent, described him as "thinking he was Jesus Christ." In another city a board member with many years of service declared that the board would have made significant headway on problems of minority group education except for the resistence of several key administrators. Some board members attributed the failure to lead in solving minority group problems to central office racism, possibly unconscious. Others attributed it to lack of expertise on such matters. Whether seen as arrogance, racist outlook, or lack of expertise, the result was the same--a loss of faith in professional leadership.

The increasing financial crisis of urban schools led to challenges to the financial expertise of schoolmen. This area had long been seen as one in which school administrators excelled. Forced for the first time in the late 1960's and in 1970 to tackle the problem of allocating priorities within areas of the budget long considered virtually sacred,[2] boards and business leaders, as well as others, began to question the wisdom of their former trust in the professionals.

The publication of achievement scores in several of the cities began to pinpoint academic failure. These often could not be interpreted simply as the result of race. They opened another area to questioning. This further shook the presumption of expertise.

There are implications in this challenge for the future of urban educational governance and fiscal support. The belief in professional expertise had bridged the chasm between policymaking arenas and the classroom. Closer examination of school operation at building levels by boards created some doubts as to whether board policy was implemented properly. The statement by a chief school officer, "Sometimes I wonder if anyone is listening out there," was echoed by board members in other cities. Attempts by the representatives of the public to exert stronger leadership led to conflicts with top level school administrators and teacher organizations. As the boards in the five cities (on occasion the mayor's office in Chicago and New York especially) challenged the professional staff, the latter perceived themselves as being faced with "political decisions," a distasteful violation of professional norms. Defensively, to protect their definition of professional prerequisites, teachers organized more strongly. In several of our cities building level administrators began playing a more overt role in electing friendly board members.

---

[1] For elaboration of this point as it relates to school desegregation in several cities see Robert L. Crain. Op. Cit.

[2] In Los Angeles, for example, a portion of the school budget called the "A Budget" went unchallenged until 1970.

What became clear to more and more of the public in this process was the board dependency indicated earlier. The boards have no independent means of supervising educational operations. Even fiscal reports and achievement data were not broken out by buildings.[1] The boards relied upon the school administrators and teachers who were able to violate the spirit while obeying the letter of board policy.

In the extreme cases where an employee's actions provoked complaints from the public, the social distance from the point in the organization producing the grievance and the board was great. Only with much effort could public complaint reach the boards. The rising public discontent was felt by boards, but what they sensed was only the tip of the iceberg. Board members naturally referred people to the conventional channels before receiving complaints at the top. Isolated cases appeared in increasing number. They were still handled case by case. The combination of piecemeal action and distance between where problems arose and the board makes it difficult for general policy to emerge from the process.

The most recent stage in the sequence of disenchantment is the general public reaction against putting more money into education. It appears foreshadowed in several of the five cities. It is composed of traditional elements of tax saving, discontent with school failure, and lower middle class backlash. The absence of bold leadership toward solving the inner city problems of education may well be the forerunner of public refusal to support public education.

---

[1] Recent developments in New York, Los Angeles and Columbus indicate a trend toward reporting data by buildings may be developing. It should be noted that these developments rested upon pressures external to the organizations and did not reflect the leadership of the urban school people.

That leadership failure casts doubts upon the traditional view of city schools as large, highly centralized and tightly managed bureaucracies. Large they are and highly centralized at law. But tightly managed is inaccurate.[1]

More data appeared on our files about the need to clear things upward than did evidence of topside capacity to move schools. The long chain between policymaking and classroom task achievement appears able to stifle initiative and turn down requests. It provides a buffer for the classroom teacher from the public, even from boards, but it does not produce classroom change. The chain is long; every link complains the link above will not give it freedom to act, but a chain of command it is not.

The multiplication of official hierarchies and regulations does not indicate control from above. Instead, it indicates failure of command followed by backing and filling with additional offices and rules to overcome the earlier failure. At this moment, the New York City Schools' contract with the United Federation of Teachers may coordinate and control what goes on in the buildings more than does any set of mechanisms emanating from central office at 110 Livingston. The decentralized community control boards probably come next in impact. As one community district superintendent with over twenty years in that school system said in a recent interview, "This system is beginning to be centralized for the first time in my experience."

What the critics of urban chief school officers may have missed is that the urban school district in its present form is ungovernable except by tradition. Veto groups abound at every level. They are large sprawling organizations where interruption of processes is much easier than is a coherent guiding of them. The public has only one point of legitimate control of the process, the board. However, this point is distant and insulated from the classroom. The interaction of teacher and pupil exists either untouched or frustrated by board policy.

Federal policy should help shorten the organizational distance between public policymaking and educational task achievement in the urban school district.

---

[1] Bidwell, Charles E., "The School As a Formal Organization" Handbook of Organizations, March, James G. (ed.), Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

Cultural Constraints

The Educationist ideologies play a role in the constraints on providing quality education to inner city schools. One element in the educationist culture is the definition of the school's education task as it is applied to children of the large minorities found in the inner city. A second element is the teacher belief in professional isolation from lay influence. A third is the profession's ideology of school governance. It is perhaps the most important aspect of the educationist culture.

Definition of the School's Task

In the largest four of the cities studied there is a conflict between two diametrically opposed ideologies concerned with the educational task. These arise from the fundamental sociological and historical differences between those licensed to teach in the urban schools and their clients. It is a clash rooted in differences between new city poor and the recent city unpoor of the last American immigration wave or in-migrant wave to the city, whose daughters and sons constitute a large portion of the urban teachings ranks. The cultural conflict in the American city's inner schools may specifically be pinpointed by examining the clashing ideology of the new city poor and the educational profession around the definition of the educational task in America.

The new city poor consist largely of blacks, an old American stock, and Spanish speaking populations. Most of these groups have lived in the American heartland from the founding of the United States and others, the Puerto Rican, have been part of our country since the turn of the century. These populations have in common the fact of well established heritages developed by cultures which for generations have survived the pressure of contact with a different major culture. Their interest in American schools is emphatically not to give up their culture or to have their children made over in the style of the Americanization of European immigrants such as took place between the 1840's and the 1930's. The thrust for black studies in Roxbury or Spanish teachers in East Los Angeles is not for recognition as Columbus Day is for Italo-Americans. It is a demand for continued survival of old established American minority cultures.

These citizens expect the school to provide skills such as reading, writing, and arithmetic and credentials essential for economic success in the modern world without destroying their culture or taking their future, their children, away from them.

The school, instead, is staffed and governed almost exclusively by people whose definition of the task is influenced by the history of urban education, in the Americanization of immigrants especially

Mediterranean and Eastern Europeans. The urban school teacher is himself (more frequently herself) often the product of the last immigration waves (e.g., Irish in Boston with some Italians and Jews, Jewish and Italian in New York, Polish, Eastern European and Italian in Chicago). These descendents of recent European immigrants, whether sons and daughters or grandchildren, epitomize the product of the Americanization efforts of the urban schools in the first half of this century. The definition of the American schools' task was viewed as one of making over the immigrant child into an American in thought and outlook as well as language and arithmetic skills.

The immigrant often cooperated in breaking with his cultural roots. The process was seldom as complete or happy as the Americanization myth would have it.[1] The historical American ideological view of schools as large blenders for taking children of diverse backgrounds and providing them with the wherewithall to enter the American race for life on equal footing is increasingly more a fantasy than a fact. Rather than large blenders schools are more accurately seen as large sorting machines. They allocate future socio-economic status to most children before they enter their teens. Contrary to the old American boast most children in America today will probably occupy the same status as their parents.

The school worked better as a blender for present urban teachers than for many others. Understandably, they defend the blender function and Americanization views of the school and its task.

The urban school teacher usually cannot understand the new urban poor's unwillingness to make the same choice. The teacher rejects the separatist choice which Blacks and Spanish speaking populations are increasingly making. Instead the teacher interprets their choice as a lack of motivation.

The ideologies are irreconcilable. Indeed, increasingly minority groups are demanding that the schools reinforce the cultural heritage of their children e.g., with black studies and Spanish courses.[2] The traditional educator's view holds that school achievement can only result from the rejection of the pupil's cultural heritage and the adoption of general American cultural values and basic life style. Concessions to black history and Spanish courses are viewed by them as temporary transitional devices to bridge the cultural gap and facilitate the abandonment of the minority group's cultural heritage.

---

[1] Glazer, Nathan and Moynahan, Patrick D., Beyond the Melting Pot, Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1964.

[2] Most pupil boycotts in our data resulted from this conflict in values and related personnel issues.

Were the racial factor not present, had integration been undertaken with massive resources in the fifties, had the profession's leaders in the cities cooperated with the courts, even led the way toward integration, or had the struggle for cultural survival by blacks and Spanish-speaking peoples not been so long and bitter as it often was, conditions in the 1970's might have been different. But these "might have beens" are past. The two ideological stances are strongly held by large well established groups. The clash constitutes a major cultural constraint on providing quality education in the inner city. The President's Advisory Commission on Finance cannot make useful recommendations if this cleavage is ignored or papered over by defining it in terms of either point of view to the exclusion of the other.

Federal policy should openly confront the reality of conflicting beliefs about the educational task between most practitioners and most clients in the inner city school and search for solutions consistent with that contemporary reality.

Belief in Professional Isolation from the Public

A second cultural constraint arises from the educational profession's sense of vulnerability before the public. Historically and to this day in rural communities, teachers and schoolmen frequently occupy the roles of alien specialist change agents.[1] In suburbia teachers often find themselves on the defensive teaching children of parents better educated and more aggressive than they are. The urban teacher used to see his lot as more protected, less vulnerable, and less suberviant to parents than his perception of his rural and suburban counterparts. As late as 1963 New York City teachers offered independence from parent involvement in schools as one reason for teaching in the city.[2]

The urban teachers' environment is the anonomous city. The anonimity of urban life reinforces the urban teacher's thrust for autonomy. The historic relation of city schools with the vast bulk of the parents of their pupils is one in which the teacher initiates. Parents are most often called in when the pupil is in trouble. The urban P.T.A., as others, tends to be controlled by school people. These factors reinforce the teacher belief in isolation of the classroom and insulation of the school from the neighborhood public.

Consistent with the foregoing is the teacher's belief in professionalism and its meaning to him. Professionalism is interpreted as being free to handle pupils as teachers judge best without even colleague restraint. This freedom is threatened by standardized tests or state-wide exams. It is threatened more by having to communicate the results of such tests to parents. Even building level test profiles are a recent innovation in urban education. Similarly the lore of professionalism discourages parents from teaching children at home. The immigrant of the turn-of-the-century could only hamper the Americanization task of the school. That discouragement continued in the teacher culture until recently. It still exists in the minds of many.

---

[1] Vidich, Arthur J., and Bensman, Joseph, Small Town in Mass Society, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1958).

[2] Interviews conducted during the New York University personnel study.

Federal policy should function to reduce sharply the isolation of the urban educators from the public. It should reknit the family to the classroom, the school building to its attendance area and the school district generally to its city.

The Ideology of School Governance

The profession's ideology of school governance works to constrain the allocation of resources to the inner city school by isolating the urban school district. It weakens the school board. It reduces the range of alternatives offered to policymakers, and excludes the poor from effective participation in educational policymaking. The political constraints discussed later exist to no small extent because of the ideology of school governance held by the public.

The religion of localism is central to school governance ideology. The myth of local control reigns wider and reaches deeper to influence education than does the constitutional reality of education as a state function. The ideology of large city school governance is strikingly similar to that which prevails in small towns.

The credo that educational governance should be apolitical is applied to boards with the expectation that board members will be above party, stay out of politics, and protect the school's employees from politicians. A correlate of this doctrine is that policymaking is the province of the best laymen. Administration is the domain of professionals. Both must be separate from politics. Implicit in the dogma is an atomistic picture of the school district's public including board members entering policymaking as separate citizen atoms unrelated to each other.

One result of the ideology has been the insulation of urban school boards from the realities of the problems of inner city education. That insulation has resulted in the political isolation of urban boards from the public and dependence upon employee organization for political support.

Closely asociated with the apolitical doctrine has been the belief in the suppression of conflict. The educational enterprise, according to the ideology should avoid controversy. Where disagreements exist among school officials, these should be argued out privately. Board meetings are not the place to air dirty school district linen.

The educational enterprise's low tolerance for deviance is rooted in custodial values. Teachers who fail to control their classes are the bane of administrators' existence. Order is respected; disorder is not. Even the norms for processing client grievances conform to the non-conflict doctrine. There are routine procedures for handling gripes against the system which demand conformity and delay relief. The norms of school administration insist that problems stay inside channels. A parent who has a question about the progress of his child, for example, is expected to seek answers at the building level, first from the teacher involved (after clearance from the principal) and then from the principal. If the grievance remains unsolved, then it should remain in channels--going to a district officer. Then it goes to a central office administrator. Failing to achieve satisfaction there, the problem would eventually reach the chief school officer. The board is the court of last resort.

The other side of the non-conflict value is the press for consensus. There is in many situations an incredible push for unity and agreement. Superintendents frequently have boasted about the unanimous votes of their boards. They prize harmony among board members and between themselves and their boards. Items that are divisive are frequently tabled or postponed. Severe problems often drive boards underground into meeting informally or holding lengthy pre-meeting telephone discussions to protect the image of tranquility. The consequences of such privacy are often painful. If debate occurs in private, the depth of analysis that problems have received is unknown. The public is privy only to a rehearsed demonstration of solidarity.

Elitism is an essential component of the educational governance ideology. The language used to describe school board members and their responsibilities and functions is often elitist. The traditional literature contains phrases like "the best people" should be elected. Board membership is a "sacred trust." Persons must be "public spirited," "intelligent," "compassionate," and "understanding." They must be "dedicated" and serve as "statesmen." We only want "good" people on our boards. And historically this has meant white, middle class, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant types.

The elitist orientation enters in a second, more significant way. The ideology of expertise is, by its nature, elitist and it has been accepted pragmatically within American democratic ideology. This acceptance rests upon the belief in rational decision making by experts and owes much to the municipal reform movement. The elitism of board member characteristics is complemented by elitism of the expert. However plausible the doctrines of elitism appear, they imply an exclusion of the poor and inexpert from full participation in educational governance.

To the degree that the governance ideology is politically implemented, it makes coherent state or federal planning for urban schools meaningless and the application of federal policy impossible. The urban school board, insulated from real problems until they spill over the boundaries of customary politics of education, is politically isolated from the public and dependent upon employee organizations for political support. The range of alternatives offered to boards is sharply reduced by the press for consensus and norms against the expression of conflict. Finally, the exclusion of the poor from full citizenship in educational governance further reduces board awareness of alternatives and conflict in the school system which reinforces their dependence upon employee organizations.

Federal policy should help urban schools move towards more realistic beliefs about educational governance. This is unlikely to come about through rhetoric. It may come about through an increase in board independence from its organized employees and a greater reliance upon all the public, including the poor and inexpert.

Political Constraints

The separation of educational governance from the mainstream of American politics produced a political arena influenced by coalitions led by organized employees of the urban school district. The chief political constraints on improving education in the inner city arise from the educational politician's success in implementing the profession's ideology of government and its concern for jobs. The major political constraints may be seen in:

1. The political separation of state and city in educational governance.

2. The influence of the educational political subculture in the city used to maintain the status quo.

3. The lack of political leverage points for the participation of the city poor.

The politics of urban education exists within a context of major American political sub-cultures which influence federal, state and city governments. Political coalitions of urban school employees adjust to the dominant political cultures of their respective cities. The social composition of each city's education employee's coalition and the relative impact of coalition members are also influenced by the dominant mix of political cultures in its city.

Political Separation of State and City

The truism that responsibility and authority must go together is not less valid for its triteness. Legal relationships are weak bases for control when the beliefs and political energies of persons most involved in an area of government (usually its public employees) reject the legal view of authority. By law education is a state function delegated to local school districts for administration. In practice the political realities are quite different much of the time.[1]

In most states, the period from the 1920's through the 1940's saw the development of a politics of education which rested heavily on an alliance of a yeoman political sub-culture and state-wide educationist organizations. These alliances concentrated upon reorganization of school districts, separation of urban education from the rest of state government, increasing financial aid to other school districts, control of professional employment, and opposition to parochial schools. A state politics of education resulted, separating the urban district from the rest of the state. The urban school district's financial plight is partly the result of its political isolation from the state.

The American yeoman political sub-culture consists of the farmer, small town merchants and businessmen related to agriculture. They powerfully reflect the Protestant work-success-ethnic. Tax saving fiscal conservatism runs through their political orientation. The yeoman is committed to localism and small government. Fear of change, suspicion of the alien and a belief that city life is bad and city politics corrupt characterize this political sub-culture.

The politics of education is an area in which the yeoman political sub-culture has retained much of its former political influence despite its dwindling rural population. Educationist values concerning governance strongly reflect those of the yeoman. The yeoman sub-culture helped isolate the largest cities from legislatively based state educational politics.

One mechanism of this isolation is the legislative norm of local unity requiring consensus from cities before legislative action. Another is found in the vast array of special legislation for the affairs of the largest urban district.

The state politics of education has effectively operated to destroy the state's legal responsibility for education in the largest cities. Except for Columbus, Ohio, the politics of education generally found at the state level is significantly different from that which involves the largest city. For example, control of urban professional personnel, by law lodged in the state, is often delegated to the urban school district. Within very broad limits, the large city school in relation to state government, displays as much freedom to go its own way as the classroom teacher does with his principal, after his classroom door is shut.

---

[1] For more extensive discussion of this problem and data on the New York City events illustrating the point see Iannaccone, Laurence, Politics in Education, New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1967.

Variations exist among the five states in which our cities were located. California, Massachusetts and New York have more directly intervened in their large city school districts than have Illinois or Ohio. In general, however, a tradition of separation and virtual independence of urban school districts from their states is the rule.

There are indications in the five cities that a different state-urban school governance relationship may develop. The frequency with which cities are turning to states for extra-ordinary financial aid is increasing. There is evidence of a general change in the education lobby in its shifting its points of leverage toward larger governmental units e.g., from state to federal and from local districts to state in order to raise resources for education. These changes appear to be provoking a more critical view of urban education by state public officials. They demand that urban school districts take seriously the task of allocating priorities in use of resources, rather than continue to assume a customary growth in all "standard" expenditures. Suggestions are being made to allow the central agencies of state government direct control over some aspects of urban educational operations.[1]

Federal policy should reduce the wall of separation between the states and their large school districts.

The Educational Political Sub-Culture

In each of the five cities the governance of education has spawned a sub-culture specifically concerned with the politics of urban education. The distinction between machine and ideological politics is frequently useful for understanding American politics. The one is concerned with winning offices and jobs rather than programs and ideas. The politics of education is at once both ideological and machine oriented. The result is a widely accepted ideology of educational governance backed by employee organizations active in the politics of education.

The educational political sub-culture's alliances in each city reflect the political cultures and history of the particular city.

---

[1] New York State has recently legislated detailed admission criteria for some of the city's high schools. Massachusetts is directly engaged in building and operating a school within Boston.

Much of the history of the urban politics of education was the story of the struggle between an urban worker political sub-culture and a professional-managerial sub-culture.[1]

Essentially reformist and moderate in outlook, the professional and managerial political culture was the backbone of the municipal reform ideology.[1] Its modern business orientation predisposes it to municipal reform politics. More important than party are its ideological commitments in government. The belief in rational decision making reinforces the tendency to trust expertise and to support municipal reform and the growth of professionalism in government.

The reform political culture played a major role in breaking the city political machine's control of educational politics. Prior to World War II, especially significant during the Great Depression, school jobs had been an important part of the urban political pork barrel. After the war, reform slates supported by the organized educational professionals won a measure of control in most of the cities. Their platforms were directed toward keeping politics and politicians out of education. They generally supported civil service reform and helped to create employee personnel examination and promotion machinery to keep patronage out of schools. Unnoticed for a long time was the gradual growth of a professional bureaucracy, a sponsor-protegé personnel system, operationally defining selection criteria and promotion practices to screen in persons like themselves. The most thorough-going example of this sort of system is seen in New York. A federal court has finally enjoined it from continuing it discriminatory examination practices.[2] The elimination of discrimination in urban education personnel operations, however, threatens the advantages currently held by the urban educational politicians. This threat has recently led them to making common cause with an urban worker political sub-culture similarily threatened.

The urban worker political sub-culture consists largely of lower middle class workers. It is anxiously concerned with maintaining jobs and job opportunities. The urban worker culture carries the invisible scar of the Depression in its memory. The marginal economic security of the urban worker is threatened by the needs to supply resources to the new urban poor. The urban worker, the recent unpoor, is under pressure to share its advantages with the new poor.

The urban worker's resistance to sharing its advantages with the new city poor rests on two political bases. Their residential base is found in neighborhood political machines. Their employment organizations, unions or semi-professional associations, have acquired increased influence over decisions in local governmental arenas of public service, especially in pluralist cities.

---

[1] Hereafter referred to as the reform political culture.

[2] NAACP v. Board of Examiners of the New York City Schools, Federal District Court in New York City, Second Circuit. Preliminary injunction was granted on July 15, 1971.

The worker political culture continues to play an important role in the governance of education in three of the five cities studied, Boston, Chicago and New York.

The Boston Schools are an employment system for the Boston Irish linked by neighborhood, kinship and long standing friendships to the political ward and machine. Similar linkages exist to city hall and the state legislature. The reform movement had least effect on Boston. Chicago school government displays a balance of forces between the city political machine and reform elements that broke the machine's absolute control of educational governance in the forties. Earlier it functioned as a pork barrel for the city machine. The neighborhood is the key unit of the city machine. The political significance of the neighborhood helps explain the machine's interest in the neighborhood school. In New York the school system is one of the plurality of public service decisional arenas dominated by municipal worker and professional employee associational networks. The school pyramid is characteristically independent of the others.

Los Angeles educational politics reflects the prominance of the reform political sub-culture which has controlled its at-large board elections since its pork barrel period. Columbus most closely approximates a small district in much of its political pattern. The political influence of a coalition of social and economic elites and the reform culture on the schools is felt. The small town sacred society flavor of the non-conflict, consensus, decision making style persisted until this decade.

The adjustment of educational politics to the city's political culture may be seen in its internal balance of power between non-certified (largely blue collar) and professionally certified (white collar) employees.

In Boston an urban worker culture operating from ethnic neighborhood bases produces an educational political culture, in which the organized Boston custodians have major influence.

The Chicago non-certified employees probably rank below their Boston counterparts in influence. Their influence was historically tied to the city machine. The reform movement broke the machine's absolute control of Chicago schools and employment in them in the late 1940's. But analyses of board voting behavior and interviews in Chicago indicate a balance of reform and machine members has continued since.the reforms. At no time has either won complete control of the board.

A politically powerful coalition of administrator organizations and teachers' unions is the core of the educational political culture of New York. The school district's Board of Examiners is one of its citadel agencies. Their local personnel examination and interview process controls promotion and job allocation. The combination includes the non-certified white and blue collar organizations linked to other municipal employee groups through the New York City Central Labor Council.

The worker political sub-culture is less significant yet in the Los Angeles School District. The municipal reform ideology has tended to be dominant in this board's composition and operational style since the 1950's. The political sub-culture of the Los Angeles Schools displays the dominance of professionals over non-certified employees. The organized profession played a significant partnership role with reform board members in Los Angeles school board elections after the era of the four horsemen.

In Columbus, too, the nature of the city and its economic life militates against a strong organized worker political culture. With the support of its social and economic elite, the politics of education in Columbus has been dominated since the 1940's by a combination of the reform political culture and the district's organized employees led by school administrators.

Thus variations exist among the five cities reflecting the particular city's culture. Common to all five cities, however, is the existence of an educational politics with leadership by educational politicians, white or blue collar employees of the public school district.

The contemporary politics of education expresses the interest of school people. Where is the public interest expressed?

In all five cities boards are dependent upon the school district's employee groups for the political defense of district policies and operations. The traditional parent organization tends to be influenced by school administrators and teachers. During the increasing conflicts between boards, and professionals in 1967-1970, the boards found that the commonly used machinery of the P.T.A. organizations were capable of being mobilized by professional employee leadership, but not by themselves.

In the urban district additional interest structures with a history of reformist and anti-city machine orientation exist. These are most institutionalized in New York and Chicago. In New York City the efforts of the Bundy Commission and the mayor for reorganization were opposed by the Public Education Association's chief staff member, even though his board voted support of the reorganization. These events revealed the cooptation of presumed independent civic agencies by established employees and employee organizations. One result of the cooptation is that boards stand isolated in defending their policies to the public, whenever the employee systems of the school district oppose them.[1]

Board political dependence on employee groups has a direct relation to financing education in inner city schools. The growing strength of employee organizations at the negotiating table siphoned off the resources boards needed to make special efforts in the inner city schools. In fact, the boards found themselves turning to their states for financial relief to meet the outcome of such negotiations in New York, Illinois and California. Board efforts at loosening up the closed personnel selection and promotion systems in order to bring appropriate administrative staff into the inner city schools ran headlong into organized political opposition. Even a little opening of the traditional personnel system threatened the most privileged sanctuaries of the urban educational politicians.[2]

Federal policy should improve the balance of public and employee influence on policymaking in urban school government.

The selection of school board members is a central goal in the politics of urban education.

The cities of Chicago and New York, where mayoral appointment of board members exist, established blue ribbon nominating committees.[3] The result of this pattern in Chicago has been a balance of machine and reform members since the late 1940's. In New York from LaGuardia's day until recently an equal balance of Roman Catholics, Protestants and Jews was found on the board. In addition, labor, the P.T.A. and the Public Education Association of New York were accommodated.

Three of the cities studied use at-large elections of board members. In Columbus the significant role of the school's employee political culture recently became visible. A long standing tradition of procurement of signatures necessary for nomination from teachers by principals in the school building was made known to the public. The open support of candidates for board elections by groups of school principals, the coopted P.T.A. and the city's teacher organization, in a highly charged election, clarified the educational culture's usual political activities.

---

[1] Mazzoni, Tim L., Jr., Political Capability for Urban School Governance: An Analysis of the Los Angeles City School Board (1967-1969), Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1971.

[2] It should be noted that the loosening up attempts were not intended to bring in uncertified or untrained personnel; in fact the quality of the professionals to be brought in was not at question. What was at question was a little, a very little, of the established closed professional sponsor-protegé system. The meagerness of what the Boards attempted stands in sharp contrast to the harshness of the response on the part of the urban educationist political culture.

[3] Both but especially New York underwent revision during the studies reflecting the contemporary increased conflict and politicalization of education.

Boston custodians dominate the school committee nominations and exert powerful impact on the elections through neighborhood and public employee linkages. The organized professional groups are, however, not without power. So, for example, the general superintendent having agenda control of board meetings and control of information can selectively filter information to particular board members. As a result the professional establishment can make particular board members look good (or bad) in public and influence a board member's political future.

Together the blue collar and white collar employeed political subculture elects board members and transform some of them into attractive candidates for other elected offices. So the employee political culture of the Boston school district enjoys control over board members on their way in the board, while the board, and over their aspirations for subsequent elected careers.

There is another side to the coin. Job assignments, overtime pay, vacations, and a variety of detailed decisions concerning jobs dominate the board agenda. More direct involvement of board members in employment was found in Boston than in other cities.

The range of the employee political influence on board nomination and selection varies. But the interests of organized employee groups are regularly accommodated in the nomination and selection of each city's board members. The result is representation of some combination of the reform, worker and educational political sub-cultures. The inner city residents, the new urban poor, have access neither to board membership nor to nominating members.

Federal policy should open the selection processes for board memberships to inner city residents.

One way to understand the meaning of the educational political culture of the cities is to ask Omar Khayam's question about their trade offs,

> "I wonder what the vinter buys
> half so precious as the wares he sells."

The answer is seen when hard choices are made and priorities allocated.

At the end of the 1960's and the beginning of this decade, educational political groups began a significant turnabout in the urban politics of education.

The political culture of urban educational employees worked within the Los Angeles election process with the reform orientation in the 1940's and 1950's unseating conservatives and electing reformers. It reversed its ground in the late sixties and joined conservatives to retain autonomy, in spite of the low expenditure attitude of the conservatives.[1]

In Chicago, it worked against the machine and with the reformers in the 1940's, but by the 1960's had made its accomodation. Faced with a choice of money for innovation or better schools, even after Desmond of Chicago Teachers Union said priority would be given to conditions for quality education rather than salary, it chose salary.

In New York, education political culture was confronted with a choice between alliances with the communities which had originally supported its right to bargaining and its old foes, the C.S.A., over the issue of community control. It chose to go to bed with its old enemies rather than the public--even to the extent of reversing its earlier stance on the Board of Examiners and the examination process.

The conclusion is clear. The organized profession in its political behavior will fight to retain the status quo. It will support central office control over decision-making rather than allow the participation of local neighborhoods in decisions. Its tactic in this is defense of the neighborhood school. The neighborhood school is the profession's school. In the present structure of governance, the principal controlled P.T.A. is the only legitimated organization speaking for the neighborhood.

When the neighborhood school ideology is taken up by minority groups and they demand community control, the organized profession resists. The profession defends the ideology of the neighborhood school in order to resist integration. It limits its support of the neighborhood school concept when local control of the school is at issue. The significant common element which emerges is job protection. The profession's ideological stance is protean; its job orientation is constant.

The educational profession in the city should reorder its goals toward a more enlightened, long range self-interest.

Federal policy should upgrade the contributions of the educational professions in educational governance.

---

[1] Wallace Sayre predicted more than a decade ago that educational politicians would sacrifice board membership before associate superintendencies indicating its priorities--In Los Angeles his prediction was fully borne out. Sayre, Wallace, "Additional Observations of Organization" Teachers College Record, November 1958 Vol. 60, No. 2.

The Urban Poor Lack Political Access

In each of the cities conflict increased during the late 1960's. And it continues. Militant teacher organizations and non-conforming students produced some of this increase. But most of it resulted from discrimination against minorities and the inequality of educational opportunity in inner city schools. Conflict appeared earliest in New York and latest in Columbus. It showed least variation in Chicago under the stabilizing influence of the machine. The evidence suggests least political change in Boston during the period and perhaps the most in New York. There, following the reorganization to community boards, the present conflicts in more than thirty boards exist less violently and are more fruitfully channeled than earlier conflicts were.

There is consistency in the sequence of events characterizing the escalating conflicts. Frustrated with the result of going through channels, persons with grievances circumvent them and go right to the top. Attempts are made by boards to open the channels of communication from minority groups and inner city neighborhoods. Usually board plans to achieve openness are reduced in scope by the line and staff organization. Events such as student boycotts, strikes or "blow outs" of schools are followed by the involvement of parents and adults in the neighborhood. Their demands tend to be first denied, then compromised and finally accepted. A new style of confrontation develops. The conflict spreads and draws in third parties--economic elites and office holders in municipal, state or federal governments. A demand is then heard for changing the governance structure of the urban school district rather than only the redress of grievances.

The new city poor, usually black or Spanish-speaking, has exhibited apolitical behavior in the past. Recent indications are that this culture is growing in political sophistication. Excluded from access to the political leverage found in educational employee clubs and organizations, it may develop its own leverage and access points. Then, it would operate as a distinct competing political sub-culture in urban educational politics.

For the present it is clear that the urban poor's chance to exert political influence is through their neighborhood base. They lack membership in the job associations which play a large role in urban policy formation. In the light of contemporary political realities, theirs is a second class citizenship compared with the urban workers. So long as the new urban poor continue in a second class citizenship status their only hope for public attention to their needs comes through the noise they make. A new brand of educational politics emerged in the sixties. It was a type appropriate to the new urban poor, lacking political access but seeking identity, self-respect, and evidence of being respected.

The New York City team used the concept of status politics to describe much of what they observed and studied in 1967-1970. Status politics consists of symbolically face-smashing the opposition. It is aimed at making officials, power holders and complacent dominant groups lose face and their complacency. It is intended to make board members and officials publicly lose their cool and explode. Thus they behaviorally acknowledge the human fact of unhappy minorities. They pay a tribute which tends to restore the manhood of deprived groups.

It was the status politics of face-smashing in Los Angeles after pupil walkouts and minor violence, which brought third parties, public officials, and groups not normally present in the politics of education into the struggles. Sophisticated use of status politics by Roxbury groups directed the media spotlight onto Roxbury problems in Boston. The Chicago machine does not ignore student walkouts, while it may ignore petitions. Even in Columbus student and parent school strikes commanded the attention of school board and chief school officers and brought third parties into the politics of education.

Political realities make it impossible for Congressmen, or state legislators or mayors to stay out of education. Economic notables also enter, seeking to resolve issues which would otherwise weaken social and economic systems. Such third parties then discover that school district officials and professional groups consider them as interlopers. They encounter rigidity from school people. The specific events are laid to rest usually with minor changes. But some of the third parties come away from the experience determined to break the power of school establishments. The minority groups participating retain some of the linkages developed in the face-smashing status politics. They have gained sophistication in organizing, gaining allies and challenging the educational establishment.[1]

In New York City the process described above has gone further. It started earlier than in the other four cases. By 1967, when the New York team began its work, the situation had reached the stage of demanding the reorganization of school governance. The third party engagement had reached the point of major involvement of the Ford Foundation and the Mayor's office. Offers of New York City economic notables to aid the schools through mediation had previously been rejected by school leaders. The center of the struggle was transferred to the state capitol. It caused more of a political problem for the New York State Legislature than it had experienced in many years.

The reorganization has not ended the struggle, but the shape of that end may be in sight. Legal arenas now exist in which neighborhoods can play constructive politics instead of only status politics. Even with very little legal power, the new city poor act responsibly and develop a stake in the system. The most recent interviews in that city indicate that such a process is beginning.

---

[1] Luvern L. Cunningham and Raphael O. Nystrand, Citizen Participation in School Affairs (Washington, D.C., The National Urban Coalition) 1969.

Status politics, symbolic face-smashing, and the spread of conflict to engage third parties, sometimes disrupting state government, will continue. It will proceed as long as the new urban poor continue to hope in American government for justice and to lack legitimized access to full and equal participation in educational governance.

Federal policy should provide the new urban poor with legitimate access to full participation in educational governance.

IV

Major Recommendations for Federal Policy

IV

Recommendations for Federal Policy

Policy is direction. At the strategic level it consists of decisions to move from a present state of affairs to a desired future state. At the tactical level it consists of decisions by which strategic goals may be attained.

The major purpose of this report was to synthesize the results of the "Danforth" consortium studies as background materials for recommendations which the President's Advisory Commission on Educational Finance might consider for federal policymaking. As the commission reviews those data and judgments, it will become clear that some of the recommendations deserve additional staff study and translation into federal programs. Others, however, may better function as prudential guidelines for various federal programs intended to improve the quality of education in inner city schools.

Much of this report says urban education is in crisis. It is. This report is consistent with the project's terms of reference upon constraints. For some, crises spell only fear. Constraints suggest hopelessness. It need not be so. Otherwise the contemporary condition would be one of dull apathy rather than crisis.

There is hope. There are signs of change. There are groups in the city, professional and lay, school administrators and city officials, teachers and pupils, wrestling with the problems. Such people constitute a largely unused resource for improvement. They are many. Their effectiveness is blunted by many aspects of urban school systems. Their contribution is especially limited by the constraints discussed in this report. But they are growing in number.

Hope lies in the people most closely involved in the problems of urban education--especially those in the inner city. It lies in assisting them to become central to problem solving at the school level. Hope exists for a better partnership of teachers and parents. It can be found in improving the balance of lay and professional control of urban education. It lies in upgrading the contributions of the education professions. It lies in strengthening the ties of school, family and neighborhood. It lies in the mutual respect of pupil and teachers meeting as human beings with rights and obligations each toward the other.

The principal goals for improvement are the restructuring of urban educational governance and the development of responsible autonomy at classroom and building levels. Our strategic recommendations are:

A. Avoid non-categorical aid.
B. Create multiple tier educational governments in the urban school districts.

C. Reunite urban and state educational governance.
D. Develop responsible autonomy at classroom and building levels.
E. Reform the educational information system at each operational level.
F. Improve the education profession's contribution.

A. Avoid Non-categorical Aid

Implicit in these recommendations is the conclusion that federal aid must be categorical. Our research suggests the following outcomes if federal funding were non-categorical.

In Los Angeles: The "A" budget, now disturbed, would revert to its sacred character. This means that business as usual, would continue--at the same stores by the same structures and with the same values. Little or no serious attention would be given to the cost/benefit issues, nor would the black South Los Angeles or the Spanish-American East Los Angeles pupils get the distinctly different educational offerings they need. In a few years, there would be a need to reopen the present issues around the "A" budget or there would be a need for additional increments in federal or state contributions to Los Angeles.

In Boston: Federal funds would be used to create overtime work and on-teaching jobs for employees of the system. Most probably local effort would increase. It is unlikely that Roxbury would get even a dollar for dollar share with other areas of Boston. What little state influence there has been in recent years on the Boston schools (including vocational developments) would come to a halt. In a few years, Boston would be in fiscal trouble again and require additional federal aid.

In New York City: The additional federal funds would become the object of the next go-round in negotiations between the U.F.T. and the New York City Central Board. (The community boards might just possibly be politically established enough by then to manage to retain a small percentage of the additional funds for innovation or to provide for necessary local variations in education. But the hope is not great.) Fundamentally it would mean that the U.F.T. contract would increase salaries and use federal funds to protect the more effective schools program and extra funded secondary schools. The recent legislative involvement and acceptance of responsibility for the city's schools problems by the state would decline. In a few years the same problems would reemerge, exacerbated by white conservative populations tired of tax demands and by minority groups--Puerto Rican and Black--who would not have gained from the federal involvement. Minorities would be frustrated by another unfulfilled promise. They would lose influence over schools in which they sense that they have a stake.

In Chicago: The federal funds would be absorbed by ongoing operations without leading to differentiated programs for minority group pupils. Some additional jobs for blacks might be created by the machine The machine's problems would be eased. The Daley machine's hold on the city would be strengthened or at least continue unimpaired. The beginning of challenges by governor and legislature to the city school district's inefficiency and the mayor's control would be thwarted. In a few years, new demands would be made to expand federal funds for the city.

In Columbus: Continued annexations of suburban districts with additional new building of school plants would probably take place. These developments would not help the inner city schools unless a policy of complete racial balance in every building were undertaken. Such a policy could exist now. Nothing suggests that non-categorical federal aid would produce such a policy. Instead, the probabilities are greater that non-categorical aid would increase the inequalities between the inner city and other schools.

Recommendations

1. Federal policy should assure that all federal funds to urban education is categorical. The clearest guidelines possible should be used. These need not preclude broken front approaches or flexibility at the grassroots but should specify federal purpose and establish means for involving local publics in federal programs.

2. A gradation of non-compliance penalties should exist and be specified in federal programs. They should be designed to avoid premature application, but ensure appropriate responsibility. Urban districts need to learn that federal guidelines are purportedly constructed and intended to be followed.

3. Congress and the President should be explicit about federal intent and legislative direction rather than leaving the burden of direction to guidelines and administrative officers.

B. Multi-Tier Educational Government

The weight of evidence is clear. The present structures and forms do not work to solve contemporary problems satisfactorily;

-----they do not provide adequate opportunities for participation in decisions by parents, pupils, and the public generally.

-----the public interest can not be adequately discharged through the urban school board.

-----the school board's dependency upon the professional staff and line organization for leadership and information prevents it from developing adequate policies to solve the inner city educational problems.

-----the board's dependence upon the political support of school employee organizations emasculates its capacity to defend its policies before the public when those are opposed by district's employee groups.

-----organized school district employee groups are overrepresented in their influence upon the selection of school board members and as a result the public interest suffers.

New forms must be found for the governance of urban education.

It is interesting to note how frequently discussion of reorganization of urban educational governance suffers from the sterility of traditional assumptions and an absence of new ideas. The chief constraint on creative thinking about school governance is the tendency to retain conceptual habits of the past. Specifically this is seen when discussions of reordering school governance rely on the history of reorganization to create larger local districts. The omnipresent assumption is that all the governmental functions traditionally entrusted to contemporary local school districts must be transferred to any new ones, whether produced by amalgamation or sub-division. So long as this is so it will be impossible to both shorten the distance between the arena in which the public interest is expressed and the pupil-teacher nexus without impairing the effective expression of broader public interests in education. There is no need to remain prisoners of our traditional concepts. It simply must not be assumed that in a family of governments such as already exist in America, each government can or should be allocated the same functions merely differentiated by size or territorial boundaries.

To illustrate, if one assumes a single governmental unit must seek to balance equally the values of citizen participation and racial integration, policy decisions from that unit will compromise both and maximize neither. One dilemma faced by the New York City schools throughout the 1960's was how to combine the value of maximum public participation and integration. Ten years of efforts at administrative decentralization did neither.

Another approach would suggest that just as the family of governments in education, federal, state, intermediate and local may display a hierarchy of authority (not always in that order), so they may be entrusted respectively with a hierarchy of functions.

For example the value of racial integration is essentially a democratic one. It is a critical element in American life generally, not just education. The record in education indicates that larger districts have greater logistical capacity for racial integration by transporting children to overcome housing segregation. The record also indicates that power is seldom used unless even larger governmental units or hierarchically higher offices intervene. To entrust integration to local districts, even ones as large as New York, Chicago and Los Angeles would leave us without integration. Only the federal governments working through the courts and the other members in the family of governments can be entrusted with responsibility for the rights and privileges of citizens. On occasion this means that the courts will have to act to change attendance boundary lines to maximize integration. So long as the job is entrusted to the local school district, it will not get done.[1]

Particularly significant in considering the restructuring of educational governance is the harm that attempting to allocate integration to the local district does to our capacity to develop new models. So long as integration is entrusted to the local district it will be pitted against the value of participation and neither will be achieved.

However the issue of integration does not need to stand in the way of developing spheres of government representing the public interest close to the pupil-teacher nexus. Even an issue as broad as integration becomes no barrier to restructuring of school governance, when it is allocated to broader and hierarchically superior levels of government. The same formula will work for other broad and general American public interests in the schools. Traditional assumptions that every local board should be entrusted with all the functions of local boards of education can be set aside. The task of closing the gap between the point of entry for the public interest about the interaction of pupil and teacher can be achieved.

Federal policy should facilitate the reformation of urban educational governance. In so doing, it must protect the following values:

1. Racial Integration.
2. Equality of opportunity.
3. Quality.
4. Public Participation.
5. Flexibility in Teaching-learning.
6. Organizational Efficiency.
7. Diversity of ethnic groups.

A multi-tier government with different degrees of responsibility for different values offers opportunity to avoid compromising these values. The federal government should encourage and support the developments of such multi-tier governments in urban education. Value considerations to be dealt with include the following:

---

[1] In passing, it may be worth noting that we should not have expected anything different. The value of integration is national not particularly local and reliance on local self-interest to effect integration is expecting local self-interest to maximize a broad national value not necessarily a particular geographic one.

1. Racial Integration. This value was discussed above to illustrate the earlier point about allocation of different functions to different governments. It is sufficient here to reinforce the point. The federal government alone has the responsibility and oversight needed for all Americans in this area. It must bear the primary responsibility for protecting this value. The size of the local school decision-making or governance unit is immaterial to this function of the federal government.

2. Equality of Opportunity. This value may be thought of in various ways. Equal treatment of pupils is one. It is so described in relation to the recommendations on responsible autonomy. Equality of fiscal resources for schools is another and is treated here.

Inequality of fiscal resources results from several factors. State financial equalization formulae, the remnants of the belief that the unit of government which taxes people should itself necessarily spend those resources, and artificial boundaries separating one local school district from another are common factors.

Arbitrary boundaries produce man made extremes of poverty and wealth among school districts.[1] Too few Americans know these facts. Public ignorance abounds in regard to where education dollars are in fact spent.

To illustrate: in one city overtime pay was used for years to hand score standardized tests which could have been scored by machine. In another, overtime pay was used to operate and maintain the extensive local personnel examination system.

Until recently no significant accounting by individual buildings was available. Even now there has only been a start in that direction. The tendency for large local districts to siphon off allotments intended for those of low social standing to support general school services or provide jobs for middle echelon school people is disturbing. Whatever federal funds are used for the inner city schools, Federal policy should require a school-by-school financial accounting each year. In addition, such information on a school-by-school basis must be shared with the citizens of the city, unless the federal government is to create a gigantic auditing inspectorate.

---

[1] As this report was written the California Supreme Court declared the local tax base form of inequality unconstitutional. The court held: "To allot more educational dollars to the children of one district than to those of another merely because of the fortuitous presence of such property is to make the quality of a child's education dependent upon the location of private commercial and industrial establishments. Surely, this is to rely on the most irrelevant of factors as the basis for educational financing." p. 26. John Serrano, Jr., et al., v. Ivy Baker Priest, as Treasurer, etc., et al. Supreme Court of California Filed August 30, 1971.

3. Quality. Quality in education involves the engagement of the learner and those concerned with the learner in learning. It involves flexibility in teaching. It depends upon innovation. It requires a continuing interaction of practitioners and researchers for discovery. It requires diffusion of field tested results. To date the flow of diffusion still rests upon word of mouth advertising unless special financial incentives are used.

Most of these requirements are best handled as close to the learner as possible. Quality in education is primarily the responsibility of the lowest tier of educational governance. Research and development as well as diffusion of results, instead, require involvement of other tiers.

4. Public Participation. Public participation in education has come to be confined to supplying resources and legitimizing professional operations. Consequently public disenchantment can severely damage public education without improving it. Public power rests primarily on cutting off needed resources and/or discrediting the professionals. Public participation must enter decisional and operating cycles earlier, especially at problem formulation stages.

Public participation does not include the new urban poor as significant influentials on school decisioning. The existence of a single central board for all educational governance is essentially out of reach as far as the new urban poor are concerned.

There is no more significant problem in the world of public service today than that of achieving a major increase in public participation with respect to services by those who are to receive them. The absence of such participation on program decisions insures a lack of trust wherever serious differences in class and cultural orientations exist between teachers and pupils. Without a sense of property and without the feeling by people that the schools are in fact their schools, teaching goes on, but learning does not. Effective teaching requires the intelligent support of adults and children around the school building. Intelligent support is not just willingness or the belief that education is a good thing. It depends upon understanding what is going on in schools and some sense of being able to make a difference in the education of children. For most people, this can not be achieved by sitting in the audience of a school board meeting or washing dishes at a P.T.A. What is needed is much more communication between pupils, adults responsible for them out of school, and teachers. This means that decisions, especially about the educational programs, must be made nearest the delivery point.

Neither will simple decentralization of decisions allow pupils and parents to become participants in the decisional process. It is easy to conceive of a highly decentralized administrative system which leaves all decisions to professional employees alone. Federal policy should encourage the creation of councils, representatives of parents, teachers and pupils for every building. Arrangements for receiving citizen complaints of lack of representativeness on such councils should be included at the start. The existence of such arrangements from the beginning will provide the greatest assurance of genuine representativeness and obviate or greatly reduce complaints from the start.

Similarly, at each successive level of the school's administrative hierarchy, there chould be similar councils following the general pattern suggested for buildings. These provide several advantages in the present era.

1. They would provide additional listening points in the school's governance structure for those who administer and govern schools.

If one thing is clear about school governance today, it is that school boards can not discharge their function of hearing the public adequately unless they hear what is said near the points at which decisions are made and education is delivered.

2. They would provide additional access points for citizens wishing to participate in school decisions. The inconsistency of low voter turnout in school elections and high public criticism of schools can hardly be interpreted as apathy or lack of interest. Instead, what is suggested is high concern over schools and little faith in school elections as a means for making a difference.

3. They would provide avenues of legitimate participation in decisions and broaden the base of cooperation in schools. The poor especially need experience in citizen involvement in government in order both to become more effective citizens and more understanding of the difficulties encountered by school board members, administrators and teachers.

4. Flexibility in Teaching-learning. Autonomy is needed at classroom and building levels in order to maximize the value of flexibility in teaching and learning. There is an assumption in education circles which often goes with this allocation. It is that evaluation of the results of teacher-pupil interaction should not be undertaken by other organizational levels. This position should be challenged. Accountability is possible without the strait jacket of close, bureaucratic controls. Both can be achieved through involvement of public representatives at tier levels. Assessment is possible across the range of buildings and regions within the city. Assessment of learning should be the primary concern of regional centers and the central administration of the school district. It is also of interest to the state and nation.

5. Organizational Efficiency. Educational discussion of efficiency has too long concerned itself with definitions reminiscent of the depression. Personnel costs far outweigh other operating costs in education. Inefficiency in human resource utilization is more wasteful than other inefficiencies. The bookkeeper definition of efficiency can be entrusted to one tier and human utilization to another. The appropriate tier for decisions about expenditure should be determined by economies of scale. Democratic values and educational requirements should decide the appropriate tier for human resource utilization.

6. Diversity of Ethnic Groups. The urban school district services a wide diversity of ethnic groups with different values and cultures. The 19th century trend toward homogeniety of immigrant populations has been reversed in recent years. It appears to have gone too far in some ways. The quality of life today increasingly prizes diversity. The current form of urban educational governance makes little allowance for diversity. Even elected school board members are chosen in at large elections further reducing the impact of ethnic and racial differences.

No single formula of policymaking or set of policies is likely to satisfy adequately the diverse demands of different ethnic populations within the city. Nor is this merely a difference of orientation between middle and lower economic classes. Black and Puerto Rican populations, for example, differ on school issues in New York. Orientals resist the permissiveness of schools which contrast with their tradition of family discipline. Integration is not sought by the Chinese community in New York nor in San Francisco.

Educational governance should strengthen the family and culture of pupils rather than reduce them to rubble. This suggests the development of interracial boards to facilitate the solution of school problems of mutual concern. It also suggests the creation of a middle tier of representation roughly similar to the New York City Community districts. These can provide a representative base for protecting ethnic diversity in urban education.

Recommendations:

1. Federal policy should influence the development of multi-tier governance structures in urban education. These should be allocated different functions as appropriate to the populations subject to the respective tiers. In general, the broadest public interests in education should be allocated to the highest levels of governmental tiers. The level closest to the classroom should be most concerned with the individual pupil.

2. Multiple tier governance in the larger cities should include at least three levels of representative government: central board, regional boards and local building or K-12 pyramid boards. Representatives for each level should be elected from sub-districts rather than

at large, so as to provide representation for each city's large minority populations as well as for the dominant majority.

3. Allocations of functions to each level should be made explicit, preferably by law. This is to prevent the gradual absorption by one tier of the functions appropriately allocated to other tiers.

4. Each tier of government should be allocated resources appropriate to its functions. No tier should be without resources to conduct some of its own research and development, as well as innovation attempts.

5. Federal programs should immediately require the involvement of elected groups of representatives along the lines proposed above. In this way, present federal programs can provide a beginning step toward multi-tier urban educational governance. These will result in learning for citizens, who later will play larger political roles. Independently based dialogue around urban educational problems can begin immediately.

C. Reunite State and Urban Educational Government

Federal programs which tend to reunite state and urban educational governments offer chances of long run solutions to the problems of urban education. The data from the five cities suggest the contemporary urban educational crises require the combined resources and commitment of urban, state and federal governments. Hence, this report's position is that the federal government should adopt the policy of reuniting state and city educational governance and break down the urban school district's isolation.

The federal government is confronting the issue of whether to aid large urban school districts directly or through the states. The issue has immediate and long range implications. The immediacy of urban crises is a strong argument for federal programs which bypass the states. The arguments for direct aid to the cities also include the belief that such aid would be simpler and cheaper to administer. Direct aid circumvents the anti-urban bias of state governments especially legislatures and state education departments.[1] Such programs have a better chance of being uncompromisingly tailored to urban problems. Finally, it can be argued that the cities will receive more attention through programs linked directly to the federal government than ones channeled through the states.

Direct aid to the cities will reinforce the urban school's inbreeding and parochialism. The isolation of city educational governance from the states will become fixed. The federal government by implication will be undertaking a continuing and enlarging responsibility in the future of urban education. States will find it easier to ignore the urban educational plight.

---

[1] The anti-urban bias of state legislatures is discussed at length in The City by John V. Lindsay. Lindsay, John V., The City, New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1970.

The political forces for and against major governmental changes in urban education are sufficiently balanced so that strong leadership by the federal government can make a significant difference. In the long run, major change is probable. Federal leadership could make it well thought out change. Action now will reduce the time of conflict over educational governance in the city.

Recommendations:

1. Federal policy should have the objective of reuniting state and urban educational government. This objective should be approached directly and indirectly. It can be approached indirectly by making it a rule that all federal programs aiding urban education be channeled through the states. Such programs should place explicit responsibility upon the state for accountability to the federal government for urban operation of federal programs. They also should stimulate state mechanisms which could be activated upon the initiative of urban pupils and parents to assure local educational authority compliance with federal policies.

2. State departments should increase their involvement in large cities by opening offices within them, making access to the state department easier for urban dwellers. For example, where large cities are reforming their governments, the chief urban school officer might become an associate superintendent of the state education agency.

3. State governments should provide more educational services and resources to urban education. State education department personnel should reflect better the balance of urban-rural school populations. State department recruitment programs should seek to overcome the present paucity of urban experience in their personnel. Federal programs to facilitate the training of students with urban backgrounds for roles in state education departments would offer a direct approach to the problem. Administrators should be actively recruited from minority populations.

4. The inbred urban personnel system should be opened to regular state licensure. Criteria for all personnel paid by federal funds should require state certification. They should explicitly disallow recipient cities from adding local licensing requirements for such personnel. Such provisions would facilitate the employment of qualified minority group professionals.

5. The growth of metropolitanism should be supported either by governmental mergers of urban and suburban school districts or by the creation of metropolitan cooperative structures. Administrative units

or local accounting regions for federal programs e.g., Title III should be constructed so as to combine the large city and suburbs. Alternately urban sub-districts with community boards should be allowed to enter into cooperative arrangements with local districts outside the city. Conversely federal programs should reject state or local proposals which reinforce the boundary between the large city and the rest of the state.

6. The federal government should establish programs for training students with urban backgrounds (especially from minority groups) for state department roles. Urban focused internship and fellowship programs tied to state department training should be created. Similar programs should exist for legislative interns. These will link graduate training and state government around urban problems.

The recent California Supreme Court decision declaring inequities in local education tax arrangements unconstitutional has implications for policy choices on this issue. It suggests full state funding or formulas combining local and state taxes with full equalization is likely in the near future. New York State will consider this direction. So will other states. Were the federal policy to increase the isolation of urban educational governments from the rest of the state, these fiscal reforms would develop with the present political arrangements. That development would entail a lost opportunity to reunite these governments at a propitious time. Further it would make the task more difficult later.

D. Responsible Autonomy

Responsible Autonomy means achieving a balance between accountability and freedom. In schools this means professional expertise and public accountability are balanced.

The policy goal here is developing responsible autonomy at classroom and building levels. Other levels translate and transmit public policy to the teaching operation or to serve the needs of the teacher and pupil. These have service functions demanding responsiveness to the public or to the teacher and pupil. They do not require autonomy. Autonomy above the building level will exist at the expense of classroom and building freedom.

The nature of schooling requires that authority for decisions directly affecting the pupil reside in the pupil-teacher interaction. This is inescapable. Under present conditions there is an abdication of public responsibility for this interaction. Teachers control classrooms. Principals control buildings. Resource allocations are made higher up. The structure of largely autonomous layers does not discharge the public responsibility for education. They merely appear to. What exists is autonomy without responsibility, increasing conflict and pupil revolt.

The alternatives are irresponsible or responsible autonomy. Federal policy must move urban education toward the development of responsible autonomy at classroom and building levels. Theoretically there are at least four ways by which it may be achieved. These are:

(1) reliance upon the professionalism of the practitioner.
(2) reliance upon law, policy and regulations to define and protect the rights and obligations of the client and the practitioner.
(3) reliance upon close supervision and
(4) reliance upon a close linkage between representative government and the client-practitioner interaction.

The first method, professionalism of the practitioner, will not work in education. The evidence at hand is clear. Teaching is a semi-profession rather than a true profession.[1] The professionalism autonomy of true professions rests upon severe restraints which are exercised by collegial rules and backed up by collegial judgments. They are made by legitimate collegial groups with the power to sanction and even separate individual practitioners from the profession for breeches of the profession's rules. Nothing like this exists in the semi-profession of teaching.

The second method (reliance on law and regulations protecting the client) has no traditional background in education. There are some signs of developments along these lines. Federal policy should support the development of a legal bill of rights for pupils and local machinery to insure compliance. This method can ameliorate the present condition of autonomous irresponsibility in the classroom for individual students. It can not adequately advance the public interest in education. Grievance machinery will still be needed and will depend upon pupil protections at initiation.

The third method requires the close supervision of practitioners. Close supervision of teachers would result in a vast multiplication of supervisory personnel. It would reduce flexibility in pupil-teacher interaction.

The fourth method offers our best hope. Creating a close linkage between the practitioner-client interaction and the application point of representative government is essential. It reduces the chances of the system's becoming self-serving. It increases the likelihood that parents will develop a greater sense of personal responsibility for the schools. Reliance upon creating arenas where the public interest is represented closer to the classroom will reduce the pressure and conflicts of grievances. It is consistent with much of American education's history. And it fits many of the basic American values in educational governance involving a balance of professional and lay influence. It is consistent with a basic American pattern for assuring compliance with law and discharging the public interest, involving as participants people who have a direct stake in the governmental issues being decided.

---

[1] Lortie, Dan C., "The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching, pp. 1-53, The Semi-Professions and Their Organization, edited by Amitai Etzioni, New York: Free Press, 1969.

The creation of representative structures close to the building is likely to fulfill additional functions. The problems of motivation, curricular relevancy, and humaneness are better solved at building and classroom levels. The linkage of families, schools and neighborhoods can only take place at building levels. The social climate of the classroom and the building are basic to developing trust between education and the public.

The principal's role is pivotal for developing responsible autonomy. His office is the road or road block between the building and the community. His example can influence teacher interaction with pupils as well as adults in the community.

Recommendations:

1. Federal policy should foster the development of local representation at or near the building level.

2. Building councils should represent the constituencies necessary for solving local problems. This means at least pupils, teacher, parents and community should be represented.

3. Appointment of representatives from one constituency by leaders of another will not work. It is clear that especially with minority groups appointment of minority group persons by leaders of the majority usually result in selecting marginal men, sometimes in tokenism. In addition, a major purpose of responsible autonomy, the acceptance of responsibility for the outcomes of decisions, is defeated by such selection. Election or appointment to buildingcouncils of persons by others who have themselves been elected by the same constituency is the guideline to be followed.

4. Residence in an attendance area should constitute one base of election for representatives of the public. Parents of pupils residing outside the attendance area of buildings they attend should have the same rights as parents residing in the attendance area. This can be assured by separate representation of parents chosen only by parents. It can be done by letting people vote in both their area of residence (as members of a neighborhood) and where their children attend schools as parents.

5. Plans for building councils must be carefully made before bringing them into existence. Their roles must be especially clear. The

limits on such roles must be explicit at the outset to avoid unfruitful conflicts.

6. Building level councils must be given terms of reference distinguishing their functions from regional offices or boards and from the central board.

7. Continuing education of professionals is needed for responsible autonomy. Distinctions should be made between on the job training given new teachers, e.g., less than five years and older ones. Joint training with parents, community representatives and pupils should be undertaken Generally training should not be attached to credits or degrees. It should focus on problem solving. The problem should be real and emerge from local situations. The central board should allocate resources to local councils for them to conduct studies of their problems.

8. System-wide formulae to allocate resources equitably across a large range of regions should provide discretion to building principals, staffs and local communities. For example, building schedules, the ratio of teachers to pupils for given activities and team teaching should be managed at building levels within equitable resource allocations.

9. A portion of central board funds for innovation should be earmarked for projects proposed by buildings. Here inequality of distribution should be the guide. No building, however, should be completely without resources for innovation.

These policy tactics are offered to clarify the meaning of the central recommendation and illustrate directions for federal programs. The Commission's staff may wish to work on some of these. The central recommendation is: federal policy should be directed toward developing responsible autonomy at classroom and building levels.

E. Lead toward Reforming the Nation's Educational Information System

The phrase: "information system"; is euphemistic at best. Information is power today, perhaps more than in earlier eras. Nowhere is the fragmented structure of educational governance more visible than in examining educational information systems. This lack of coherence is serious. The present condition in education displays weak information systems. Moreover they are generally unavailable to the public.

Recommendations:

1. Federal policy should influence the development of a national educational information system.

2. Measurement and evaluation of educational programs constitutes one major form of information needed for urban, state or federal

planning. States should be encouraged to develop measurement and evaluation systems including e.g., costs of operations, academic achievement and measurement of affective developments.

3. Information must be available annually on a building by building basis. Otherwise comparisons of inner city schools with others will not be possible. Even if the day comes when equal investments are made to inner city schools, their adult communities will not believe it without such data. School building profiles should be developed annually. Federal program requirements can lead the way.

4. Information should be public. Democracy does not work without public information. If information concerning educational activities, costs and results is concealed from the public or reported so that it can not be used by them, they will make bad decisions in the short run and lose faith in the long run. Public data provide a base for community involvement and action to protect the public interest. Otherwise there will be no compliance with federal policy or compliance will require an army of federal inspectors.

5. Information for educational decision making should be drawn more broadly than from education alone. A total information system should permit "cross sector" analyses. For example, educational policy planners should understand the implications for education of public investment in welfare. And the reverse implications should be noted too.

F. Improving the Education Profession's Contribution

The short sighted, self-service beliefs and political behavior of urban school employees was noted repeatedly in the research examined for this report. These findings should not lead to the conclusion that urban educationists are less competent than other people. It should, perhaps, challenge the belief that they are necessarily more competent and therefore miracles should be expected of them. A realistic view suggests that extensive retraining is needed for urban educators--those in inner city schools, but others too.

The present report can not propose detailed retraining programs but some recommendations can be offered about conditions of support and the nature of such programs.

Recommendations:

1. The federal government should undertake with the state and city cooperatively to support programs of in-service training for urban educators.

2. Such programs should not be designed to earn college or salary credits. These is too great a chance already that the extrinsic rewards attached to such things as advanced course work outweights the intrinsic ones in motivating people into in-service activities. In-service training detached from extra pay and college credits is recommended.

3. In-service training programs should include as participants all persons needed for effective education in the inner city: teachers, administrators, counselors, pupils, parents, community leaders and school supporting personnel.

4. Retraining should be problem oriented. The problems taken up should in so far as possible be current and local. Problems, in the final analysis, can be solved only where they are.

5. In-service joint training should attempt to reknit the school, family and neighborhood. It should, also, seek to use underutilized human resources in the process. For example, combinations of teachers, para professionals, high school students and parents could function as learning teams working on problems in middle schools.

6. Joint training experiences combining the work of municipal officials with school people should be undertaken. The exchange of jobs for brief learning periods is likely to reduce conflict among public agencies having a common interest in children.

7. The federal support for in-service training should be provided to facilitate the reformation of educational governance as well as the operations in districts undergoing restructuring. There is little point in attempting in-service training for major changes in urban schools that are unready to accept the risks of change.

A FINAL NOTE

At this point in our history we are confronted with a dilemma. Do we invest massive new federal resources in urban systems without demanding reforms? Or do we demand urban school reform as a condition of substantial new investments? Can one proceed without the other?

Happily in our judgment there is no need to delay first steps in the reform of large urban educational systems. Almost any federal program reaching into the large city can begin with the incorporation of recommendations included in this report. We believe that making a start with those concerning multi-tier government and responsible autonomy are imperative.

But make no mistake! Relief from long developing problems in urban education will require new federal commitment. It will require the allocation of new resources on a massive scale. The improved contribution of professionals is absolutely essential. But society can not ask for dramatic changes from any profession unless that society is also willing to make a major resource commitment to achieve institutional change.

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1972 O - 453-403